

98th YEAR

No. 888

THE

# DUBLIN REVIEW

A QUARTERLY AND CRITICAL JOURNAL

Edited by ALGAR THOROLD

JANUARY 1984

1. "DISARMAMENT" IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.  
By Montgomery Belgion.
2. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN NAZI GERMANY. I.  
By Lee J. Stanley
8. AUSTRIA YESTERDAY AND TO-DAY. By  
Danubianus.
4. THE PROBLEMS OF THE SPIRITUAL CANTICLE.  
By Montgomery Carmichael.
5. THE HISTORICITY OF ORPHEUS. By Charles King.
6. NOTES ON FRENCH POETRY SINCE THE WAR.  
By Sommerville Story.
7. KING MANUEL AND PORTUGUESE LITERATURE.  
By Aubrey F. G. Bell.
8. THE ISSUES OF CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGY. By the  
Rev. J. Arthur O'Connor.
9. C. M. DOUGHTY AND A MARONITE MONASTERY.  
By Donald Attwater.
10. BUCHMANISM. By J. Wm. Poynter.

QUARTERLY REFLECTIONS.  
SOME RECENT BOOKS.

LONDON

**BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE LTD.**

Price 8s. 6d. net.

Yearly Subscription, 15s. Post Free.

*Registered at the Post Office, Chicago, as Second-Class Matter.*

---

**Burns Oates & Washbourne**

---

**1934**

## **THE CATHOLIC DIRECTORY**

The 97th issue of this indispensable handbook of the Catholic Church in Great Britain. Edited at Archbishop's House, Westminster, it is the official organ of the Hierarchy of England and Wales. Its monopoly of information secures its use by clergy and laity throughout the year. A map of Dioceses and Missions in England and Wales is included.

*Cloth, 3s. 6d.*

---

## **THE CATHOLIC WHO'S WHO**

The issue for 1934 includes a Preface by

**SHEILA KAYE-SMITH**

*Cloth, 5s.*

---

**LONDON :**

**43 Newgate Street, E.C.1 & 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1**

**and at MANCHESTER, BIRMINGHAM, GLASGOW and DUBLIN**

---

---







# THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW

*The oldest established of the Monthly Reviews*

- ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆
- ★ The most reliable guide to the trend of all modern thought
  - ★ Its political articles survey the deeper issues underlying political events, searching and examining ground which the daily press cannot hope to cover
  - ★ Its articles of general interest reflect the thought of thinking mankind
  - ★ The most distinguished names appear in the Contributors List
- ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

## SINGLE COPY ORDER.

To The Manager,  
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW,  
13, Buckingham Street,  
London, W.C.2.

Please post the January number of  
the Fortnightly Review to

---



---



---

for which I enclose 3/6

## SUBSCRIPTION ORDER.

To The Manager,  
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW,  
13, Buckingham Street,  
London, W.C.2.

Please post the Fortnightly Review to  
me for six months twelve months for which I enclose

£1 1 0  
£2 2 0

---



---



---

# THE CRITERION

*A Quarterly Review*

Edited by - - - T. S. ELIOT

JANUARY, 1934

## CONTENTS

Irving Babbitt - - - HOFFMAN NICKERSON

The Moral Dilemma of the Age of Science

PHILIPPE MAIRET

A Short Poem for Armistice Day HERBERT READ

The Accessory - - - - GUY DENT

Mr. Housman at Little Bethel - EZRA POUND

Myth in the Making - - - JOHN COUNROS

Four Poems - - - LOUIS MACNEICE

Wordsworth's Beliefs - - - BASIL WILLEY

Censorship More or Less

MICHAEL DE LA BEDOYERE

A Commentary - - - THE EDITOR

Fiction Chronicle - - - ORLO WILLIAMS

Art Chronicle - - - - ROGER HINKS

Music Chronicle - PHILIP F. RADCLIFFE

German Chronicle - - - MAX RYCHNER

Books of the Quarter Shorter Notices

Foreign Periodicals

PUBLISHED BY

**FABER & FABER, LIMITED**

24 RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

CONTINENTAL AGENTS: THE SERVIRE PRESS LTD.,

RIETZANGERLAAN 15, THE HAGUE, HOLLAND

*Thirty Shillings per annum*

# THE DUBLIN REVIEW

January, February, March  
1934

LONDON  
BURNS OATES AND  
WASHBOURNE LTD.

**C**OMMUNICATIONS in regard to articles and all books for review should be addressed to Mr. Algar Thorold, Editor of THE DUBLIN REVIEW, The Gravel Pit, Chalfont St. Peter, Bucks.

No MSS. can be returned unless accompanied by stamped addressed envelopes. Articles can only be received on the understanding that publication alone is a guarantee of acceptance and payment. Articles should not be submitted to the Editor without preliminary correspondence.

Communications respecting the Publishing Department should be addressed to BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE, Ltd., 43, 44, 45 Newgate Street, London, E.C.1. Advertisements should reach the Publishers not later than the 10th of the last month of each Quarter.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW is published on or about the 1st of January, April, July, and October.

PRINTED IN  
GREAT BRITAIN,  
AT THE ANCHOR  
PRESS, TIPTREE,  
:: ESSEX ::

# CONTENTS

JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH,  
1934

	PAGE
Art. 1. "Disarmament" in the Sixteenth Century By Montgomery Belgion	1
Art. 2. The Catholic Church in Nazi Germany. I. By Lee J. Stanley	16
Art. 3. Austria Yesterday and To-day By Danubianus	29
Art. 4. The Problems of the Spiritual Canticle By Montgomery Carmichael	43
Art. 5. The Historicity of Orpheus By Charles King	59
Art. 6. Notes on French Poetry Since the War By Sommerville Story	72
Art. 7. King Manuel and Portuguese Literature By Aubrey F. G. Bell	87
Art. 8. The Issues of Catholic Sociology By the Rev. J. Arthur O'Connor	101
Art. 9. C. M. Doughty and a Maronite Monastery By Donald Attwater	117
Art. 10. Buchmanism By J. Wm. Poynter	121
Quarterly Reflections - - - - -	139
Some Recent Books - - - - -	146

LAFAYETTE, reviewed by DOUGLAS WOODRUFF (p. 146); CELTIC PEOPLES, reviewed by H. O. EVENNETT (p. 148); THE USE OF POETRY, reviewed by MONTGOMERY BELGION (p. 151); THE ENGLISH WAY, reviewed by MICHAEL DE LA BÉDOYÈRE (p. 153); A RECALL TO DANTE, reviewed by BARBARA BARCLAY CARTER (p. 155); THE LIMITATIONS OF SCIENCE, reviewed by W. R. THOMPSON, F.R.S. (p. 156); THE OXFORD MOVEMENT, reviewed by N. J. ABERCROMBIE (p. 159); CAVALIER, reviewed by DAVID MATHEW (p. 161); NATURE AND SCIENCE SERIES FOR CHILDREN, reviewed by A. T. (p. 165); FATHER SPENCER (p. 166), and THE PILGRIM'S GUIDE TO ROME (p. 168), reviewed by E. I. WATKIN.

# THE CLERGY REVIEW

is a practical, constructive magazine for the Pastoral Clergy ; devoted to the reasoned exposition of doctrine and practice ; neither controversial nor merely defensive. It covers all departments of sacred learning and practical affairs of actual interest to its readers.

**MORAL THEOLOGY    COMPARATIVE RELIGION**  
**CANON LAW                SOCIOLOGY**

*THE CLERGY REVIEW* for 1934 will contain practical articles on the working conditions of the priest's life, and articles on the public questions of the day in their canonical and moral aspects. The Clergy will find that there is nothing more useful to them in periodical literature than

## THE CLERGY REVIEW

It appeared with the commendation of His Eminence Cardinal Bourne, His Eminence Cardinal MacRory, and the Archbishops of Tuam, Cashel, Birmingham, and St. Andrews and Edinburgh.

## THE EDITORIAL BOARD

comprises the Presidents of the English Seminaries at home and abroad, under the chairmanship of His Grace Archbishop Downey. The Joint Editors are :

THE RT. REV. BISHOP MYERS, M.A.

THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

With the collaboration of the RIGHT REV. MGR. CANON GEORGE, D.D., Ph.D., and the REV. JOHN T. ARENDZEN, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

## PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST OF EACH MONTH

Annual subscription £1 (or \$5), post free to any part of the World.

---

The Manager, "The Clergy Review", 1 Arundel St.,  
W.C.2



# The Dublin Review

JANUARY, 1934

No. 388

## ART. I.—“DISARMAMENT” IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY \*

1. *The Oxford Reformers*. By Frederic Seebohm. (3rd ed., Longmans, 1887; also in Everyman's Library.)
2. *A Life of Dean Colet*. By J. H. Lupton. (Bell, 1887.)
3. *The Utopia of Sir Thomas More in Latin from the Edition of March 1518 and in English from the first Edition of Ralph Robynson's Translation*. By J. H. Lupton. (Oxford, 1895.)
4. *Opus Epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*. By P. S. Allen and H. M. Allen. Vols. I-III. (Oxford, 1906-13.)
5. *The Epistles of Erasmus*. By F. M. Nichols. (Longmans, 1907-18.)
6. *Erasmus Against War*. (London, 1907.)
7. *La "Querela Pacis" d'Erasme*. Par Elise Constantinescu-Bagdat. (Paris, 1924.)

FREDERIC SEEBOHM, in that admirable book of his, *The Oxford Reformers*, propounded a preposterous thesis. It was that John Colet, the founder of St. Paul's School; Erasmus, the outstanding figure of the Revival of Learning and much else besides; and Sir Thomas More, worked jointly and in mutual understanding for the reform of the Church—for “the whole Church and the lives of Christians” to be “reanimated by the Christian spirit”—and that “their reform was refused”. Seebohm, indeed, went further. By supplementing his exegesis of Colet's views with quotations from Wilberforce's *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, he sought to make out that Colet's and Samuel Wilberforce's theologies were closely akin. The former thesis is no more to be accepted than the latter. It is true that Colet was More's spiritual director. It is true that More looked upon Erasmus as his dearest friend. There is considerable evidence that Erasmus's first meeting with Colet was, as Seebohm has so strongly maintained, the occasion of a

\* This article is based on a chapter from a book on Erasmus to be published shortly.

## 2 "Disarmament" in the Sixteenth Century

turning-point in the former's life. After Colet's death, Erasmus declared that in the whole course of his varied existence he had met only two saints and that Colet was one of them. But there never was any concerted action or plan for religious reform among them; still less can it be said that their plan was refused. No doubt at that time reform was in the air. "For centuries there had been a desire for the reform of ecclesiastical discipline", are the familiar words with which Bossuet opens his *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*. No doubt, More, Erasmus, and Colet, being all three deeply earnest men, shared the general concern with the problem. The fact is, however, that the religious attitude of each differed from the attitudes of the other two.

Thomas More was a layman and primarily a lawyer. For a time, he had believed he possessed a vocation. On one occasion he gave some lectures on *De Civitate Dei*. But on the whole, though he opposed heresy, he did not regard himself as really a theologian, and when in the end he came to be beheaded, it was, one may recall, for two points of law, albeit points of law having a theological basis. As for clerical reform, he confined himself to deploring the number of unemployed priests and the way in which, as a result of their being so numerous, any man of position could engage one to act as footman to his wife. Both Erasmus and Colet were clerics, but in the same matter of clerical reform they sought to effect no revolutions. Erasmus certainly complained often and long of the ways of monks, but where what he said did not apply equally to laymen it was occasioned by the hostility displayed by the regulars as a class to the New Learning, and at times his respect for certain orders he did not hesitate to express. Though an Augustinian or Black Canon, he had no ecclesiastical position, and he was not qualified to propose reforms for either the regular or the secular clergy as a whole. In any case, he had much else to attend to. Colet, as Dean of St. Paul's, was content to discharge his judicial duties with a due allowance for human frailty and to give the example of a strictly Christian simplicity. On the other hand, Erasmus and Colet were idealists in a way that Thomas More was

not. They exhorted all who would listen to follow as closely as possible a Christian ideal. But the ideal of each was for individuals and was expounded to individuals. There never was, there never could be, any question of such ideals being enacted by this or that prince or set up by Papal bull. Moreover, the ideal of each was different. To the extent they were agreed, they merely echoed the proposals put forward by Pierre d'Ailly on the one hand, and by the German theologians on the other, at the Council of Constance half a century before either was born.

Yet there was something about which Colet, More, and Erasmus did all three see as one. All three were united in their opposition to war. And Colet and Erasmus did place the objections they saw to war before certain princes. That was their reform which was refused. At the time nobody heeded them, least of all Henry VIII and Charles V whom they respectively approached. Machiavelli had lately treated war as an inevitable event, and the whole of Christendom, not to mention the Turk and the Infidel, agreed with him. Now, on the contrary, a large body of opinion exists in favour of disarmament, and so now it may be worth while recalling once again why Colet, More, and Erasmus came forward in their day as the champions of peace. In particular, it may be worth while pointing out what Sir Thomas More really meant—for that has been disputed—and how he and Colet and Erasmus were animated by what the League of Nations lacks—a spiritual principle.

In 1511 Henry VIII had been on the throne for two years, and for decades England had enjoyed peace. The abortive Cornish rising of 1497 had not affected the country as a whole. The death of the avaricious and despotic Henry VII had come to his subjects as a release, and their new-found freedom gave them a sense of power. The people were thus ready to welcome the diversion of a war after a long and prosperous spell of peaceful tyranny, and they hated the French. Henry, on his side, was still young, and he was eager to deck his brow with the laurels of a victorious warrior. At that time the conciliar theory still had its adherents, and egged on by his minister, Cardinal Georges d'Amboise, who coveted the tiara,

#### 4 "Disarmament" in the Sixteenth Century

Louis XII of France summoned the Pisa *conciliabulum*. The Pope Julius II—in his way a magnificent old man, but better fitted to lead *condottieri* than to ward the keys of heaven—had imitated his notorious predecessors, Sixtus IV and Alexander VI; he had procured his election by corruptions and thereafter brazenly resorted to simony.\* He trembled with mingled alarm and rage. He was not slow both to avenge and protect himself. The kingdom of mainland Sicily—otherwise Naples—was under Papal suzerainty, it was claimed by France and by Spain, and its throne was vacant. Julius conferred it upon the crafty Ferdinand of Aragon. It was an age of grandiose bargaining. In return, Ferdinand promised to co-operate against the French; and the Holy League against France was proclaimed at Rome. But Ferdinand preferred that a cat's-paw should fight his battles. Henry was his nephew by marriage and very much under his influence. Receiving a golden rose from Julius and—to adopt a vivid expression of the period—worked upon by Ferdinand, Henry joined the Holy League. Two years later he decided to fight for Ferdinand and the Pope in earnest and fitted out an expeditionary force, which was to be landed at Calais. It was then, according to Erasmus (I quote Lupton's translation in his *Life of Dean Colet*), that Colet

preached a noble sermon before the king and his court on the victory of Christ, exhorting all Christians to war and conquer under the banner of Him their proper King. For they, he said, who through hatred or ambition were fighting, the bad with the bad, and slaughtering one another by turns, were warring under the banner, not of Christ, but of the devil. At the same time, he pointed out to them how hard a thing it was to die a Christian death; how few entered on a war unsullied by hatred or love of gain; how incompatible a thing it was, that a man should have brotherly love without which no one would see God, and yet bury his sword in his brother's heart.

So outspoken was Colet's sermon that the king, Erasmus

\* Cf. L. von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Renaissance* (1924), iii, 694, 794; Machiavelli, *Opere* (1805), vi, 29 sqq; Mandell Creighton, *A History of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation* (1882-94), iv, 60.

says, felt the report of it might upset the soldiers he was about to lead abroad and extinguish their lust for battle. Colet was not without enemies. The Franciscan, Edmund Brygate, who had just become Bishop of St. Asaph, and exerted some influence with the king, was one of them. Another was his own bishop, Richard Fitzjames, who disliked both Colet's way of dressing in black instead of in the customary purple of his office and his "ancient and true theology". Whether one or the other sought to make mischief or not, the dean was summoned to visit the king at Greenwich. The interesting feature of the incident is Henry's extraordinarily skilful behaviour at this interview. He did not tax Colet with having used injudicious language in his sermon. He began by saying that he wished to unburden his conscience of some scruples and hoped "with the help of your counsel" the better to "discharge the duties of our office". In the face of this gambit, it was quite impossible for Colet to do anything but reassure the king, so that in the course of their hour's conversation Henry was able to prevail upon him "to say at some other time, with clearer explanation, what he had said already with perfect truth, namely, that for Christians no war is a just one. And this was for the sake of the rough soldiers, who might put a different construction on his words from that which he had intended." Colet has been accused of behaving on this occasion as a time-server or sycophant. It is not for his fellow-men to judge him, but it should be obvious that he could not have acted otherwise. Whatever he might have said or done, he would not have dissuaded Henry from going to France. In such circumstances, he would have been a churl to have refused the king's moderate request so admirably led up to.

Henry landed at Calais on 30 June, 1513. The English campaign in French Flanders was over before the end of September. By then the French had been defeated at the Battle of the Spurs, when the famous Bayard "*sans peur et sans reproche*" was taken prisoner, and Thérouanne and Tournai had been captured. The English foot-soldiers had had the spectacle of a Holy Roman Emperor with his modest company serving among

## 6 "Disarmament" in the Sixteenth Century

them as a mercenary. Maximilian drew wages from Henry and was not under his own banner, but under the banner of St. George. He served thus because, ever a most impecunious sovereign, he needed the money. And Henry was glad of his services, for by that time Maximilian's experience had been, if not often successful, certainly long and varied. Thirty-four years earlier, at the same Guinegate where the English were about to put the French to flight, he had fought a battle against Louis XI. However, the important fighting during these months took place on English soil. While Henry was making futile conquests in Flanders for the sake of anxious and angry Julius and cunning old Uncle Ferdinand, James IV of Scotland invaded Northumberland. In violation of a treaty with England, James had entered into a league with Louis XII. The moment seemed ripe to support his ally and serve his own ends as well. He was opposed by the Earl of Surrey, and on the evening of September 9 he "and the flower of the Scottish nobility" were lying dead on Flodden field. Beside his own body was that of his bastard, the youthful Archbishop of St. Andrews, whom Erasmus, when tutoring him in Italy, had found the most charming and diligent of pupils.

In 1516 Thomas More sent the manuscript of his *Utopia* through Erasmus to the leading printer in the Low Countries, Thierry Martens of Louvain, and the first edition appeared before the end of that year. There is much about war in both the first and the second books. Here I can do no more than refer to the description in the second book of how the Utopians behave in regard to war. They have, I may recall, a threefold policy.

In the first place, they make no leagues, holding that no man ought to be counted an enemy that has done no injury, that the fellowship of nature is a strong league, and that men are better and more surely knit together by love and benevolence than by covenants and leagues.

Secondly, although both the men and the women of Utopia train themselves in the arts of war, the Utopians never give battle but in defence of their own country, or to drive out of the land of their friends the enemies that have come in, or to deliver some people from tyranny.



Thirdly, they are ashamed to achieve a victory with much bloodshed. They rejoice and vaunt themselves if they vanquish and oppress their enemies by craft and deceit. Abhorring bloodshed, they class the hunter with the slaughterman and leave both occupations to their serfs. In the same way, they prefer fighting with brain to fighting with muscle. They try to make away with the leaders of the nation with which they are at war and to get men in that nation to assassinate those leaders. If they are driven to it, the Utopians "procure occasions of debate and dissension to be spread among their enemies; as by bringing the prince's brother, or some of the noblemen, in hope to obtain the kingdom".

It is More's intent in ascribing to the Utopians this threefold policy in regard to war that has been disputed. Of the intent two things have been alleged. "He must be dull indeed", it has been declared,\* "who does not perceive" that More, in saying that the Utopians "procure occasions of debate and dissension to be spread among their enemies; as by bringing the prince's brother, or some of the noblemen, in hope to obtain the kingdom", is boldly satirizing the conduct of his own sovereign, Henry VIII, who, after James IV of Scotland had perished at Flodden, tried by every means to get the infant James V and the infant's mother, Henry's own sister Margaret, into his power. Henry, through his agent, Lord Dacre, corrupted some of the leading nobles of Scotland and successfully fomented dissensions among them, so that every effort of the regent, James V's grand-uncle, the Duke of Albany, who had been recently brought back from French exile, was nullified by civil war. To allege any such satirical intention in More is, however, completely to misunderstand his attitude.

When a man accuses others of dullness of perception, he may really be himself the victim of hyperacuity and have perceived what is not there. This must be a case of the kind. To begin with, there is not the least evidence that More was shocked by Henry VIII's tactics in Scotland. To a Scottish historian they may now seem to have been underhand. But in the eyes of an impartial

\* By the chief authority on the period, J. S. Brewer.

## 8 "Disarmament" in the Sixteenth Century

observer there is still nothing reprehensible about them. For years Scotland had been working against England. The Scottish invasion which resulted in the Battle of Flodden was unprovoked and, as I have already said, in violation of a treaty. It was undertaken for two reasons—one, that Henry with his soldiers was away in France, leaving England apparently undefended; and, two, that Scotland, in spite of its obligations to England, had become the ally of France, against whom Henry was then fighting. As an ally of England's Continental enemies, Scotland was a thorn in England's flesh. If England were to be secure on the Border, Scotland must be disrupted. Henry's tactics were excellently designed to achieve that needful purpose. In what, then, the impartial observer will ask, were they wrong? More, however, was not an impartial observer. For one thing, he was a contemporary; for another, he was an Englishman as opposed to a Scotsman; and, furthermore, he was at that time the friend and close supporter of Henry. Accordingly he had every reason to regard any means employed for neutralizing Scotland as permissible, provided it was successful. To saddle him with the intention of satirizing this particular sample of Henry's behaviour is therefore fantastic.

So much to begin with. But the main and overwhelming objection to the allegation is this. If, on the one hand, it is unlikely that in any context More would have condemned Henry's tactics in this particular instance, it is, on the other hand, simply impossible that he should have endowed the Utopians with an attitude of which he disapproved and which, on that account, he might deal with satirically. For he invented Utopia as a model commonwealth wherein all things were done as they should be. Either, whenever he speaks of Utopian practices, he is describing his ideal in dead earnest, or the *Utopia* is altogether meaningless. If for one moment it could be supposed that he mixed up his serious description of model political conduct with a satire of his own king's actions, he would stand exposed as a literary bungler of the first order.

I suspect that there would never have been the attempt



to suppose anything so outrageous but for a desire to believe that More must have shared with the present-day Englishman the delusion—so successfully exploited in anti-German propaganda eighteen and nineteen years ago—that war is purged of its evil if it is conducted according to the conventions of "sportsmanship" and is given some imagined affinity with a cricket match or a boat race. For More to have been thus deluded, he would have had to anticipate the sporting Englishman of to-day in supposing that war is in any circumstances susceptible of acquiring saving graces. Of course that is just what he never could have supposed. What the modern mind needs to grasp is that to More all war was hateful. In his eyes, there was no possible way of redeeming it. It was irremediably evil. To have suggested to him that those conducting a defensive war ought to observe the rules of "fair play" would have been like asking a doctor to behave as a sportsman in fighting, say, the pallid spirochete. More's view, indeed, was that those who promote wars are no better than the bacteria of disease, and he wanted them dealt with in the same relentless way. Thus, unquestionably, when he says that if the Utopians were driven to undertake war, they waged it by craft and deceit, there is no satire, and he means what he says. That is how, in his opinion, a defensive war should be conducted.

The second allegation\* is that, in making the Utopians prefer to fight with brain rather than with muscle, More betrays himself to have been a disciple of Machiavelli. It is as wide of the mark as the other. Like the other, it is made in complete obliviousness to More's point, so that to dispute it will be to throw this point into sharper relief. Machiavelli, in *The Prince*, gives some advice to a ruler for discouraging neighbours from attacking him, but where Machiavelli speaks of actual warfare, his precepts are all for the conduct of wars of conquest. More, on the other hand, considers only wars of defence. The Utopians do not make war, he says, but in defence of their own country, or to drive out of the land of their friends the enemies that have

\* Made in the *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. i.

## 10 "Disarmament" in the Sixteenth Century

come in, or to deliver some people from tyranny. The distinction is fundamental. The ultimate aim of the Utopians, whenever they find themselves engaged in war, is so to discourage and maim the country attacking them or their friends that that country at any rate will never attack them again. They only fight wars to end war. It is true that "to deliver some people from tyranny" can be and has been used as the pretext of an offensive war. But More cannot be considering that, for once again, if the *Utopia* is to make any sense, he must be in dead earnest. In short, but one just inference is to be drawn from the *Utopia*, that More looked upon war as so evil that he wanted it stamped out, and, wishing to have it stamped out, deemed all means of discouraging it justified. That is not Machiavellian. In More's day it was an attitude akin only to that of Colet and Erasmus.

Erasmus had come to England from Italy in the summer of 1509, and, except for a month or so in Paris, he remained here uninterruptedly for five years. When he brought that long stay to an end, in the summer of 1514, he gave as one of his reasons for leaving the effects of war—the change in the genius of the English people, the general rise in prices, the impossibility of obtaining wine, and the difficulties he had in keeping in touch with printers, patrons, and friends on the Continent. It was like him to consider the disadvantages of war from his own standpoint. Most of us, from 1914 to 1918, did likewise, and he has thereby made the age in which he lived more vivid for us who read him. But he had other and more general objections to war. He mentions some of them in the same letter in which he voices his personal complaints. Shortly afterwards he expanded the indictment into his essay, as we should now call it, on the adage "*Dulce bellum inexpertis*" (War is pleasant to those who know it not), the English translation of which was last reprinted under the title of *Erasmus Against War*.

In this the first objection he puts forward is that men have evidently not been made to fight one another.

Man's body [he says] shows that Nature, or rather God, hath

## "Disarmament" in the Sixteenth Century 11

shaped the creature, not to war, but to friendship ; not to destruction, but to health. The animals are armed, man not : naked, weak, tender, he has no armour, but soft flesh and smooth skin.

He goes on to say that war is merely consecrated by custom, and that it is a horrible thing that man should array himself against man. Having painted the horrors of war and the blessings of peace, he remarks how incomprehensible it is that war should constantly be engaged in by those who profess and call themselves Christians.

If some new guest [he says] should come out of the lunar cities, where Empedocles dwelleth, or else out of the innumerable worlds that Democritus fabricated, into this world, think ye he would not rather judge Christians to dwell in any other place than in those countries, wherein we see so great superfluity, riot, voluptuousness, pride, tyranny, discord, brawlings, fightings, war, tumults, yea, and briefly to speak, a greater puddle of all those things that Christ reproveth than among Turks and Saracens ? . . . Was there ever war among heathen peoples so long continually, or more cruelly, than among Christian people ?

It is, he also insists, no sanction of war that a trio of Popes—Sixtus IV, Alexander VI, and Julius II—had recently given the example of it.

Now they lay against us [he says] divers bishops of Rome, the which have been both authors and abettors of warring. True it is some such there have been, but they were of late, and in such time as the doctrine of Christ waxed cold. Why are these few examples most in mind ? Why turn we our eyes from Christ to men ? For doubtless the bishops of Rome were men.

And then he once more utters the warning, which from the moment of his writing his *Enchiridion* in 1501 he never tired of repeating, that we are not accepting Christ unless we obey Him.

If [says he] we acknowledge and take Christ for our author, which is very Charity, and neither taught nor gave other thing but charity and peace, then go to, let us not in titles and signs, but in our deeds and living, plainly express him.

The final objection Erasmus has in the *Dulce bellum inexpertis* to urge against war is that with which we

## 12 "Disarmament" in the Sixteenth Century

to-day have become familiar in the guise of "the Great Illusion". It is the objection that war does not pay. Even when successful, a war often costs the victor, he points out, more than the victor can win by it.

Nowadays [he says] we see that almost all wars spring up I cannot tell of what titles and of leagues between princes, that while they go about to subdue to their dominion some one town, they put in jeopardy all their whole empire. And within a while after, they sell or give away the same town again, that they got with shedding of so much blood. . . .

If we cannot do in every point as becometh a prince, yet at least do as the merchantman doeth: he setteth naught by that loss which he well perceiveth cannot be avoided without a greater loss.

The *Dulce bellum inexpertis* was no chance attack on war made by Erasmus out of distress at the consequences of Henry VIII's ambition to become a conquering hero. In his monumental collection of classical adages, he frequently condemns war, notably in expounding the adages, "*Scarabeus aquilam quaerit*", "*Imperitia*", and "*Simulatio et dissimulatio*". One of his very earliest compositions was a declamation on the blessings of peace, and this is not surprising, for during his boyhood in the semi-independent See of Utrecht he had seen with his own eyes what war meant for town and countryside. After a first outbreak in 1470, civil war from 1477 until 1492 desolated the greater part of the vast see—it comprised the present Dutch provinces of Utrecht, Groningen, Drenthe, and Overijssel—the temporal rule of the bishop, David of Burgundy, being opposed by the faction known as the Kabeljauwschen (or Cods) and supported by the rival faction of Hooks. Castles were captured, looted, and destroyed. Marauders came from the County of Holland into Utrecht and went from Utrecht into Gooiland. The soldiery lived on the civilian population and plunder was their admitted perquisite. The peasants saw their growing crops laid waste, their harvests commandeered, their women raped. Whenever a town changed hands, the invaders were let loose to seize and destroy what they liked. Upon all weighed the heavy burden of frequent levies of money.

It is indeed not surprising that Erasmus never forgot the experience of those early days.

Nor in after-years, when he began to travel, did he cease coming into contact with the folly and blight of war. At the time of his first arrival in Paris, probably in the autumn of 1495, the French king Charles VIII had just returned from lavishing men and treasure upon the conquest of Naples, and within a few months he must have heard with the rest of Paris how the whole of that costly effort had been brought to naught and not a Frenchman remained on Neapolitan soil. Later, in Italy, he was driven from Bologna by the wars of Julius II and from Padua by the wars of the Emperor Maximilian. And so on throughout his long life.

But in 1516 there was, it seemed to him, the prospect of a general peace. In that year he settled in Brabant, at Brussels. Civil war had broken out once again farther north. Encouraged by France, Charles of Egmont, Duke of Gueldres, had just violated a truce and resumed his old revolt against the Hapsburg domination of the Low Countries. He had reorganized the notorious Black Band, which carried sword and fire all over the south of Holland and excelled in such exploits as the massacre of some schoolboys in the rood-loft of a church. This Black Band Erasmus denounces again and again, and of an end to such rebellions he might well have despaired. Yet at the same time it did seem to him that peace among the great rulers of Christendom was at hand. He had just acquired a new and powerful patron in Jean Le Sauvage, the Chancellor of Burgundy. In the previous year, the future Charles V, then aged fifteen, had been freed in his governorship of the Low Countries from the tutelage of his aunt, Margaret of Savoy, and Le Sauvage and Charles's grand chamberlain, Guillaume de Croy, Lord of Chièvres, were now the real rulers of those lands. They wished to prevent Charles from becoming once again the creature of his grandfather Maximilian, as he had been for so long as Margaret was regent. To this end they commissioned Erasmus to write for the young prince the *Institutio principis Christiani*, in which the benefits of "a tempered

#### 14 "Disarmament" in the Sixteenth Century

monarchy"—that is to say, a monarchy where the ruler has the support of advisers—are strongly commended. They also wished Charles, and Maximilian too, to enter into an alliance with France and the victor of Marignano, Francis I. To prepare Charles's mind for this, they asked Erasmus to write the *Querela Pacis* (The Complaint of Peace). That is how in the *Querela* France comes to be described as "the intact flower of the kingdom of Christ" and as being "alone His most safe refuge".

In the matter of the alliance, they were successful. It was contracted by the Treaty of Cambrai, signed on 11 March, 1517. However, though ostensibly an alliance to keep the peace, this understanding was not so in fact. By the time the treaty was signed, Ferdinand of Aragon had died and Charles, as his grandson and heir, had succeeded to the crowns of Aragon, Castile, and Naples. In the following June secret articles were appended to the treaty providing for the partition of Italy into two kingdoms, a Spanish kingdom under Charles and a French under Francis. But of this there is no doubt that Erasmus, when he wrote the *Querela Pacis*, had no inkling. He did not suspect he was being used as a tool, and he did not prostitute his pen. He honestly believed that an era of general peace was at hand, and he only reiterated the same bold and fearless views he had expressed in all independence before.

Like *The Praise of Folly*, *The Complaint of Peace* is a declamation in the first person. Peace exposes the hidden motives which then governed European diplomacy and so frequently led to wars. They are: (i) the anger, the absurd and wicked passions, the mad and silly ambition for glory, and the insatiable avidity of princes; (ii) insults and injuries suffered or imagined by princes; (iii) the desire to recover a real or supposed debt; (iv) the desire to extract money from the people; (v) the absence of good faith in the making and keeping of treaties; and (vi) the grudges produced and the offences given by princely marriages. Peace declares that the art of diplomacy lies in finding pretexts to justify the actions inspired by such hidden motives. It is "the diabolical art of loosing war". According to Peace, even defensive



wars are a mistake, unless undertaken against invasions by the Turk and the Infidel.

The practical measures Erasmus had to propose for the prevention of war were not likely to be put into effect. Peace says, for instance, that a prince can only be a prince if his people are rich and prosperous and he governs a free people. Therefore a prince must master his passions. She also asks that the frontiers of the different countries should be fixed once and for all. Those are counsels of perfection.

Indeed, the great merit of the *Querela Pacis*, as of Erasmus's other writings against war, lies elsewhere. It lies in the way the avoidance of war is demanded in the name of a spiritual principle. The *Querela* concludes with an appeal to princes and theologians, to magistrates and the powerful of the earth, and to all Christians, for the restoration of Peace to honour. And this appeal is based on the Gospel. Peace recalls the "new commandment", "That ye love one another". She quotes the words, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you", and the words, "That they all may be one". And then she goes on to point out that Christ called Himself a shepherd and His disciples His lambs, and it is in order to draw the following conclusion :

Communion with the Body and Blood of Christ can only mean a confirmation of the close and indestructible union which should exist among men.

That is the principle—the unity of all Christians—in the name of which Peace in the *Querela Pacis* of Erasmus implores men all to give her a place in their hearts. It is the principle that Colet enunciated so emphatically in his Good Friday sermon of 1513 before Henry VIII. It is the very principle Sir Thomas More had on his lips when in 1535 he went to the scaffold.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

## ART. 2.—THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN NAZI GERMANY

IT is nearly a year since the Nazi revolution swept over Germany, and during this period the relations between Hitlerism and the Catholic Church have passed through various phases. Every political revolution in a Christian country which alters the form of the State is bound to present new problems for the Church arising out of its changed relations to the temporal dispensation, but in the present instance several factors have rendered these problems unusually difficult and delicate. First and foremost comes the fact—which will be considered later in detail—that the Nazis' conception of the functions of the State assign to it a field of activity which would appear to be almost limitless. Further, the difficulties of the Church in Germany have been multiplied by the rapidity and vigour by which Germany's rulers have consolidated or attempted to consolidate their power through the extension of their influence and authority to nearly every conceivable department of national life. Thoughtful observers of the German situation believe that the immediate future is likely to see a grave and fundamental conflict between Church and State; but the developments of the last few months have been so kaleidoscopic that a short review of them is necessary to form a sound judgment of the reality of the danger which is apprehended.

When the Nazis first seized power they realized that the Catholic parties (the *Zentrum* in the North and the Bavarian People's Party in the South) were the most formidable obstacle to their absolute monopoly of political power. In the case of the remaining parties, the numerical weakness of the German Nationalists rendered them incapable of effective resistance, whilst the Communists and Socialists, though strong in numbers, could be and were dealt with by sheer terrorism and suppression. The application of such crude methods to the Catholic parties whose programme was based on the religious faith of one-third of the German people was obviously out of the question. At the same time the continued exis-



tence of these parties was regarded by the Nazis as a menace to their power which must at all cost be removed. The influence of the *Zentrum* in the Rhineland with its overwhelming Catholic population, above all in the compact industrial centres, and the Bavarian People's Party's hold on the Catholic peasants of the South, the class which the Nazis of all others wish to keep under their exclusive influence, constituted together a potential opposition which Hitlerism could not afford to ignore. Under these circumstances the policy adopted was that of postponing a frontal attack on the Catholic parties until they had become isolated by the exclusion of the remaining political groups, and at the same time to weaken their position by means of drastic restrictions of their activities.

The Nazis proceeded by stages. The proscription of the Communist Party, and the wholesale arrests and imprisonment of its leaders, was the first step ; and, after an interlude which was taken up by an intensive persecution of the Jews, the second offensive, the destruction of the Social Democrats, was launched. This offered no great difficulties. The party's Press and activities had already been proscribed, many of its leaders arrested, and, although most of the Socialist deputies were still permitted to take their seats in the Reichstag and the State Diets, any attempt at independent action was liable to be met by violence or imprisonment. All that remained to be done was the formal proscription of the Social Democratic Party, which incidentally enabled the Nazis to confiscate the whole of the party's funds.

This step brought the total number of Reichstag deputies who had been excluded up to 143 (in a Chamber of 474), and the way was now clear for the next move in the direction of the "Totalitarian State".

In the meantime the Catholic parties had adapted themselves as well as possible to the anomalies of the new situation. They had frankly offered to co-operate with the new Government in every constructive effort, and had voted for the Enabling Bill which empowered the executive to govern and legislate independent of the Reichstag and the President. Nevertheless, they were

## 18 The Catholic Church in Nazi Germany

excluded from all participation in the Reich Government and in the new State Governments formed from the automatically reconstructed State Diets.

The campaign against the Catholic party began in Bavaria. The Bavarian Nazi leaders belong to the extremist wing of the forces which direct the Nazi movement; and Bavaria, where the Government was unhampered by the moderating influence of the Nationalists, was during the last months the field for "trying out" experiments which, if necessary, could be repudiated by the Reich. In many cases, however, the Bavarian Government, acting in conjunction with the Berlin extremists, has been able to stampede the rest of the central Nazi Government into official acquiescence in a policy which the more moderate elements regarded with great misgivings. The Bavarian Nazis determined on a plan of action which would force the Bavarian People's Party to surrender and would so influence the Reich Government as to ensure the simultaneous capitulation of the *Zentrum*.

The Congress of Catholic Apprentices and Journeymen began in Munich on June 8, but the extremists in the Bavarian Government had long before determined to break up the Congress by organized violence and to follow this up with an anti-Catholic offensive all along the line.

A more unjustifiable act of aggression than the breaking up of the Congress would be difficult to imagine. The association, which was founded by Kolping, is an entirely non-political organization which aims at uniting Catholic apprentices and journeymen, safeguarding their material interest and fostering their moral welfare. The Congress consisted of many thousands of young men from all parts of Germany, as well as several delegates of foreign branches of the same association.

Formal permission had been received from the authorities for the Congress to be held; this permission was subject to specific conditions which were scrupulously adhered to in all respects. The members of the Congress were accorded an official welcome by the Nazi mayor of Munich, and Herr von Papen, the German Vice-

Chancellor, took a prominent part in the proceedings. At eight o'clock on the evening of June 10, a meeting was held in connexion with the Congress at which 10,000 delegates were present. At the same hour the Bavarian Minister of the Interior issued an order banning the orange-coloured shirts worn by the Kolping apprentices. These shirts, which were worn with black ties, have been the recognized attire of members of the association for several years, and the sole objection to them was that their colour resembled the brown shirts of the Nazis. This order was only made known to the meeting two hours later, and in the meantime hundreds of Nazi storm-troopers had been lined up outside the meeting-hall. The organizers of the Congress, realizing that a deliberate trap had been laid, urged the delegates to endure with Christian patience and fortitude the ordeal which they would have to encounter. They advised young men who had coats with them (many had come without, as it was a warm summer's night) to turn up their coat collars to avoid even a semblance of offence. When the meeting dispersed there was a veritable orgy of hooliganism. Hundreds of the young apprentices were beaten and maltreated. In many cases their orange-coloured shirts were torn from their backs and they were left to find their way home half naked. Although others hid their shirts by turning up their coat collars, the storm-troopers tore their coats open and dragged off their shirts. Rubber truncheons and riding-whips were the weapons chiefly employed by the Nazis. Although no ban had been placed on the Association's badges, these were violently ripped away from the delegates' coats. "Swine" was the most frequent term of abuse employed towards them, while numerous priests who attended the meeting were reviled with such epithets as "black-coated vermin". Several priests were insulted and maltreated; one of them after his ill-treatment collapsed in the church and was afterwards found dead. These acts of violence continued for several hours. During the night the Munich branch of the Apprentices' Association was raided by brown-shirts, luggage ransacked, and young men assaulted. Several of the apprentices were taken into hospital,

## 20      The Catholic Church in Nazi Germany

one of them suffering from a double fracture of the jaw. The police, though repeatedly appealed to, did not stir a finger to put a stop to these disgraceful scenes.

A few days after this outrage the Bavarian anti-Catholic campaign was in full swing. The holding of further Catholic conferences was prevented, the Catholic Youth organizations were dissolved, and on June 21 began the attack on the political party. The offices of the Bavarian People's Party were raided throughout the State, and all the prominent members of the party were arrested; vague and contradictory allegations of "high treason", "sabotage", spreading "atrocious propaganda", all of which were quietly dropped later, were made a pretext for this action. Town-councillors, editors, and functionaries of Catholic organizations were arrested wholesale, and towards the end of June the total number of Catholics in confinement could not have been less than three or four thousand. The campaign was by no means restricted to the laity: many priests were arrested, and sometimes attacked; the funds of Catholic societies and organizations were confiscated in the Palatinate. In Protestant districts the Nazis exploited anti-Catholic prejudice for their own ends; and, had circumstances not combined to bring the campaign to an end, there is little doubt that a religious conflict with consequences of incalculable seriousness would have ensued. The situation was partly eased, for the Nazi extremists had gained their ends; they had forced the Government in Berlin to exert pressure on the remaining political parties to dissolve themselves under threat of proscription. The Bavarian People's Party and the *Zentrum* dissolved themselves, recognizing that a futile resistance involved persecution and hardship for thousands of their followers. At the same time negotiations for a Reich Concordat which Herr von Papen had initiated during his visit to Rome in the Holy Week were expedited. The Concordat between the Holy See and the Reich was signed on July 20. Hitherto concordats had only existed between the Vatican and the States of Bavaria, Prussia, and Baden, and the new instrument was the first to apply to Germany as a whole.

## The Catholic Church in Nazi Germany 21

The Concordat was somewhat hastily negotiated, and incurred criticism from either side. The main fact, however, which the critics failed to appreciate was that this instrument was the means of averting a direct conflict between the Church and the State. Apart from this, however, the Concordat was recognized in moderate circles as a fair compromise, allowing for the extraordinary conditions under which it was negotiated between the two parties. Whilst the Church in Germany renounced all participation through Catholic political organizations in the government of the State, at the same time the clergy secured a higher degree of recognition in the Reich than previously. The existing State concordats which are confirmed in the new instrument functioned smoothly, because all three State Governments concerned were either dominated or largely controlled by the German Catholic political parties. If the present Concordat is working badly, as indeed is openly admitted by Nazi leaders, the causes lie partly in the ambiguous wording of certain clauses, but far more in the difficulties inherent in the problem to be solved.

The question whether or not an open conflict is to break out in the future between the Church and the Nazi State is only in a subordinate degree a matter of arrangements between the Vatican and the Wilhelmstrasse; it depends on who is to triumph in the never-ceasing struggle which is going on behind the scenes between the moderate and extremist groups in the Nazi leadership. If the extremists triumph, their victory must, in the very nature of things, signify a declaration of war on the Catholic Church. Merely political revolutions can be carried out without involving more than transient and non-essential misunderstandings with the Church. The Nazi revolution goes far deeper. The fact that it has abolished the Catholic political parties is a matter of regret for every German who has realized the great contributions to the well-being of the nation which the *Zentrum* has made, and the heavy loss caused by the exclusion from political influence of men like Brüning, who are the sanest and most efficient politicians which Germany has produced. Nevertheless, if Nazi claims

## 22 The Catholic Church in Nazi Germany

stopped here the problem would be a simple one, but the truth is that Hitlerism is, as its spokesmen openly and emphatically declare, not merely a political movement but a *Weltanschauung*, a religion in the widest meaning of the term.

A striking illustration of the religious pretensions of Nazidom is the struggle going on at present in the German Evangelical Church, a struggle which is being waged by non-Nazis and a small number of moderate Nazi Church members on the one side and the extremist Nazi members on the other. This struggle is being followed by German Catholics with profound interest, for grave issues depend on its outcome.

Although Hitler has promised to respect the independence of the Protestant Churches in Germany, his pledges and assurances have been utterly disregarded. A United German Evangelical Church was founded and a Reich Bishop appointed. A small minority of the Evangelical community, consisting of fanatical Nazis, was able to override the will of the majority, to force the bishop's resignation and the appointment of their own nominee. With the Nazi organization behind them it was not difficult for the "German Christians" (such is the modest title which this radical group has chosen) to secure majorities in the elected bodies of the new Protestant Church. The appointment of Government commissioners, the dismissal of conscientious pastors, the interruption of church service, and wholesale intimidation were among the means employed. Vigorous resistance is still being offered by those who see in the ascendancy of the "German Christians" a menace to the foundations of Christianity, and some of the more moderate Nazis in high places seem anxious to apply the brake; nevertheless, it is hard to see what is to prevent the extremists from ultimately having their way. What this would mean for German Protestantism may be realized when it is remembered that among the "reforms" proposed by the "German Christians" is the elimination of the Crucifix and of the Old Testament. Indeed, the final goal of this group is the foundation of a new religion based on the Nazi principles of nationality and race, the



absolute supremacy of the State and the glorification of violence, and the forcible conversion of the German Protestant community to this creed. It is little wonder that the best elements in the Evangelical Church are appalled by the developments which have taken place during the last few months and that the danger of schism is every day increasing. Those who attempt to dismiss the demands of the Nazi religious extremists as too grotesque to be taken seriously have not understood the history of the Nazi movement since the end of January 1933. In almost every sphere of activity the radical elements have been making headway. Hitler has been forced again and again to break solemn pledges extracted from him, for example by President von Hindenburg, Baron Neurath, and Herr Hugenberg. Every failure of the Government's policy at home and abroad (and their number is great enough) has strengthened the hands of the reckless and irresponsible elements in the party. It would be too much to say at the present juncture that extremism is bound to triumph, for it may still be possible to put over the helm and abandon the present course ; but the power and influence of the "wild men" have grown by leaps and bounds, and every passing week increases their chances of victory. Those Catholics in Germany who foresee a disastrous conflict between the Church and the State in the near future find the gravest danger not so much in the nature of the Nazi doctrines but in their determination to force them on others. *Gleichschaltung*, the creation of uniformity, is a process which has been applied to every institution in Germany except the Catholic Church. The Nazi mentality seems to recoil from the idea of differentiation. Uniformity must prevail everywhere. One party, one flag, one form of greeting, and art and literature and the stage all dominated by Nazi principle. And why not one Church ? Already some extremists are asking the question. The German people have already been told that they must all think alike. Is it not logical, urge the zealots, that they should all believe alike ? The preposterous idea of welding the Catholic and Evangelical Churches together into a "United German National Church" is at

## 24 The Catholic Church in Nazi Germany

present confined to a small, perhaps insignificant Nazi circle, but the upheavals of recent months have produced such a complete topsy-turvydom that even the most fantastic suggestions from a Nazi source cannot be dismissed with contempt. The criterion of Nazi proposals is not to be based on their own merits but on the degree of seriousness with which they are adopted by the active elements in the party. Judged impartially, one would suppose that common sense and self-interest alone would induce the Nazis to avoid an open breach with the Church, but during their short period of office the present rulers of Germany have shown that, however it may be with other Governments, this argument does not hold good in an attempt to understand the policy of Herr Hitler and his collaborators.

The danger of a fundamental issue being joined between the Church and the Nazis tends to overshadow those individual features of the Government's legislative programme which conflict with Catholic belief. Some of these involve that kind of artificial interference with the laws of Nature to which Catholicism has always been opposed. One instance is the amendment of the German penal code which the Ministry of Justice has announced will authorize physicians to end the sufferings of "incurable patients". According to a memorandum issued by the ministry incurable invalids who are tormented by pain will be able to claim the right to have their sufferings cut short by death, and in cases where the patient is no longer capable of expressing his wishes the right may be exercised by his near relatives. The principle of the sterilization of the unfit has already been embodied in a Government Bill which in the normal course of events is to come into force on 1 January, 1934. The object of the Bill is officially described as "the prevention of inherited disease in posterity". Persons who suffer from hereditary disease (which includes congenital mental deficiency, hereditary physical deformity, schizophrenia and habitual alcoholism) may be sterilized, if in the opinion of medical science serious mental or physical defects would be likely to appear in their offspring. The person concerned may himself suggest that he should



be rendered sterile, but the sterilization proposal may also be made by medical officers with regard to persons in hospital or by the governors of penal establishments. The Bill envisages the establishment of a "eugenical court" which is to consist of a magistrate, a medical officer of health, and a specialist in hereditary disease. The hearing will be *in camera*, but an appeal against the decision to a superior tribunal is permissible. When a valid decision to sterilize has been made the requisite surgical operation will, if necessary, be carried out against the will of the person concerned, and direct force is to be applied if needs be. The Bill, it is officially stated, should be looked upon as "an act of neighbourly love and of regard for posterity".

The sterilization Bill, like the "euthanasia" proposal, is part and parcel of a far-reaching programme of "eugenic and racial reform" to which the Nazis attach vital importance. According to the Hitlerite theory the German nation must be purged of "racially foreign" elements (hence the attempts to prevent "mixed marriages" between "Aryan" Germans and Jews); and, further, an exclusively "healthy" generation must be bred, and the national resources strengthened by the elimination of the "useless" and the "unfit". The German Minister of the Interior, Dr. Frick, has declared his intention of legislating in order to counteract "this modern 'humanitarianism' and social solicitude for sick, feeble, and inferior individuals".

If, apart from the measures discriminating against the Jews, the German Government has not yet passed any important laws which are strongly opposed to Catholic principles, this has been mainly due to its preoccupation hitherto with other matters, especially the crushing of its political rivals. But now that the so-called "elections" of November 12 have seated the Nazis more firmly than ever in the saddle, and have furnished them with what they themselves (rightly or wrongly) regard as an overwhelming popular vote of confidence, the new rulers of Germany are likely to go rapidly and ruthlessly ahead with their various far-reaching schemes of "eugenic and racial reform".

## 26 The Catholic Church in Nazi Germany

A question which is causing grave concern in the Catholic community, and which is the main obstacle to the satisfactory working of the Concordat, is one which arises from Nazi precept and practice in connexion with the training and education of the rising generation in Germany. The avowed aim of the Nazi movement is the persistent and systematic inculcation of its doctrines into every German boy and girl from early childhood onwards.

As far as the Catholic youth of Germany is concerned the Church has always claimed the right to exercise a religious and moral supervision over the children of Catholic parents. How far are the two claims compatible? The Nazis maintain that they are prepared to relegate the moral education of young Catholics to the Church, but that they alone have a right to exercise political influence over them. It is all a question of terminology. The Catholic Church employs the word "moral" in a far wider significance than that attached to it by Hitlerites; on the other hand, the term "political" is restricted in its meaning when used by Catholics, whereas in the mouth of a Nazi its application is unlimited. If a Catholic youth is taught to love his enemies the instruction from a Nazi point of view involves "pacifism" and "treason" and hence falls under the category of "political". But when responsible leaders of the Hitler Youth organization, who are to be the sole preceptors of political doctrines, solemnly conjure Catholic lads in their teens to recognize "the sublimity of bloodshed", where is the Catholic who would not describe such instruction as "moral" or rather "immoral"? The clauses in the Concordat which have failed in practical application are precisely those which deal with the training of the young, and their failure was inevitable. The young lads of the Hitler Youth are told that Hitlerism is a religion. "I am neither a Catholic nor a Protestant," declared the leader of the Youth organization, Herr Baldur von Schirach, "but a German." The "political" instruction imparted to German boys by their Nazi teachers includes the inculcation of racial and national prejudice, deliberate hatred of the Jews, the worship of brute force, and the principle that the murder of a

political opponent is a deed of heroism. The men who pervert the minds of children in this systematic fashion know well enough that it is impossible for a child who has been thoroughly trained by Catholic teachers to accept their doctrines; hence their demand that Catholic instruction shall be limited to what they regard as non-essentials. The contradiction is irreconcilable, and to talk of compromise in the ordinary sense is futile. The question at stake has nothing to do with politics; it is a purely moral issue. Either the Catholic child in Germany is in the future to learn morality from the Church or else from Nazi theorists. It cannot embrace the doctrines of both.

In a significant speech on the relations of Church and State the Bavarian Premier declared emphatically that the influence of the Church in political matters must end in Germany once and for all. This claim has been insisted on by responsible Nazi leaders not once but a hundred times during the last few months; but the corollary, the elimination of political influence in Church affairs, is never mentioned, for the Nazis—in spite of the Concordat—believe that they are entitled to use the Church for purposes which are purely political, and have made several attempts to do so, although with very indifferent success. As an instance may be cited the efforts which they made to induce priests to influence Catholic voters during the services on the Sunday before the November elections were held.

A striking instance of the Nazis' firm belief in the superiority of force as against conciliation was the appointment of Herr Schemm as Bavarian Minister of Education when the Hitlerites seized power. Bavaria is by far the most Catholic State in Germany, and the appointment of a Protestant to this post was, to say the least, tactless. But it is only when it is recognized that Herr Schemm is violently prejudiced against the Church, and that he controls a daily newspaper which is full of covert and open attacks on Bavarian Catholic priests whose enthusiasm for Hitlerism does not suffice for him, that the full significance of such an appointment can be appreciated to the full.

## 28     The Catholic Church in Nazi Germany

Whatever the outcome of the next few months may be, the Catholic Church in Germany may fairly claim to have done all in her power to avoid a breach with the State. German Catholics have steadfastly refused to give the Nazis the flimsiest pretext for their favourite charge of "sabotage", and in doing so both laymen and clergy have made heavy sacrifices and have endured bitter ordeals. The optimists who point out the case of Italy, and recall the fact that under Mussolini's rule several Church-and-State crises were at the last moment averted, forget that the claims of the "Third Reich" are all-embracing, far exceeding those formulated by the Fascist State in Italy, and it is significant that the realist Mussolini was one of the first to warn the Nazis against the extravagances of their "*Weltanschauung*".

In spite of all this, no one should be unduly pessimistic regarding the German situation; for, as already pointed out, the issue depends on the internecine Nazi struggle between moderates and extremists; and, although the radical elements are unquestionably gaining power at the expense of their rivals, their definite victory is not yet assured. There are many unforeseen factors which may help the moderate faction to recover lost ground, and it is by no means impossible that the tension between Catholicism and Hitlerism may be eased through circumstances quite unconnected with the conflict of Church and State which is causing anxiety to all well-meaning and responsible Germans.

LEE J. STANLEY.

### ART. 3.—AUSTRIA YESTERDAY AND TO-DAY

**W**HEN the Austrian Empire fell dismembered in 1918, this event was understood by many people to be the most serious blow that Catholicism had received in and after the Great War. As the importance of Spain had become very small and the King of Italy was entangled in perpetual quarrels with the Pope, the Apostolic Emperor was the only remaining important sovereign of the Catholic world. Now, his empire had vanished. The attitude of the successor-states towards Catholicism was entirely different. Some of them were founded by a nation which had been always the enemy of the Government of Vienna. As the Habsburgian dynasty had always emphasized its Catholicism, these nations too became at the same time enemies or, at least, no trustworthy sons of the Catholic Church. The Czechs, for instance, had always been enemies of the Habsburgian dynasty, and on the fall of that dynasty they became so anti-Catholic that there have often been quarrels between the Vatican and Prague. The recent conflict with Monsignore Ciriacci, the apostolic Nuncio, is the best evidence of the anti-Catholic attitude of Czechoslovakia. There were other successor-states which were not distinctively anti-Catholic, but the socialist parties, which were at that time predominant in their territories, did not pay any attention to Catholic questions. They were only interested in social problems.

During the two years from 1919 to 1920, the political power of Catholics had almost disappeared in Austria. The Socialist party, then the most powerful party in the State, declared religion to be every man's private business and wished the Government not to interfere with any religious questions. The Socialist Chancellor, Dr. Renner, was anti-clerical. There were three great political parties in Austria at that time. The socialist party, called the Social Democratic Party, was the most powerful. The Catholic party, called the Christian Social Party, had but little influence, though it was about as numerous as the socialists. The third party was not so numerous as the socialists and the Catholics ;

it was called the All-German Party. This was a moderate nationalist party aiming at the unity of the "Reich" and Austria. There were besides some smaller groups so unimportant that it is not worth while to describe them.

In 1920 the socialists resigned their seats in the Cabinet, upon which the Christian Social Party became the most powerful party in the country. In a very energetic manner, the new Chancellor, who was the leader of the Christian Social Party, Dr. Seipel, tried to bring Austria, which had suffered so much from the consequences of the Great War, into an order. Dr. Seipel, who died in the summer of 1932, was a Catholic prelate and a professor at the University of Vienna on Moral Theology. He was a very wise and skilful politician. It was he who induced the League of Nations to help Austria when it was near ruin in 1923. The economic situation of Austria was in a terrible state, as the factories and all the economic institutions of the country had been built for an empire of sixty millions of people; the population of post-war Austria, however, is but little more than six millions, and the possibilities of an export trade are small, as every country is to-day surrounded by high tariff walls. Dr. Seipel, whose moral qualities were as high as his oratorical ability, really succeeded in making Austria a consolidated State. All the successors of Dr. Seipel in the chancellorship were conservatives, and followed in his steps the programme of a modern Catholic conservatism. Nevertheless, while these governments were in power and until 1930, the Christian Social Party was the biggest and most influential party in the country. It polled about 45 per cent. of the votes at the elections. The socialists were then less numerous, but they had, and retain until the present day, a large majority in Vienna—two-thirds of all votes at the last elections. In general, they are more numerous in the larger towns, while the Christian Social Party is more popular among farmers and the commercial classes. Vienna, however, is the socialists' stronghold.

In 1930 a new period of Austrian politics began. The influence of the politics of the "Reich" on the trend of Austrian political thinking has always been very great.



The Nazis in Germany were constantly growing in importance. This anti-socialistic and nationalistic trend of politics was organized in Austria by the "Heimat-Wehr" or "Home-Defenders". The Heimat-Wehr is a militant organization, very conservative and anti-socialistic, modelled on the Italian fascists, who support them with large sums of money. There are many who think that Italy wishes to get Austria into her sphere of influence by means of a Heimat-Wehr dictatorship. In a short time the Heimat-Wehr grew great and influential. Their military organization was good and efficient, and their green-white emblems were a very attractive feature to many people.

So a new political problem arose. Until 1930 Austria had been a State which was governed in an entirely democratic way. Democracy had not been very favourable to the Christian Social Party. Most of its leaders were old men accustomed to the late Dr. Lueger's democratical way of politics. Dr. Lueger was the glorious Catholic "lord-mayor" of Vienna who made the Christian Social Party great and influential. His methods became after the war almost a dogma of Catholic politics. These methods had been very good and efficient in former times, but now many circumstances had changed. Most of the leaders were too old to adapt themselves to the new state of affairs. Dr. Seipel had tried to alter the Catholic method of politics, but constant illness hampered any real success. Consequently the continual attacks of the socialists were often successful. It happened very often that the Catholics lost a by-election or a mayoralty. And the worst of it was that they lost the Catholic youth. Young men do not like to be led by old and cautious men. They always wish for an energetic policy bringing quick success. Thus the Catholic youth became the most pressing and urgent problem of the Christian Social Party. Should the Catholic party continue to be democratic or not? The conservative leaders soon saw they would lose all ground by remaining democrats. The energetic socialistic propaganda was very dangerous. The socialists were very well organized, they were in continual contact with their members, and they had an



excellent Press. Besides, their military organization, the "Republikanische Schutzbund"—Defenders of the Republic—very well drilled and plentifully armed, became a powerful instrument of the Social Democratic Party's policy. On the other hand, the Christian Social organizations had grown "arterio-sclerotic". Most of them had been founded before the Great War. All their leaders were old men, and the rising generation did not fill up the empty places of those who had died. It seemed to be only a question of time for the Christian Social Party to disappear and the socialists to win the majority throughout the country. The All-German Party had in the meanwhile entirely disappeared. Now the Heimat-Wehr became the saviour of the Christian Social Party. Their militant and highly active organization was exactly what the conservative Catholic youth of Austria had longed for. The military organization was independent, but the political *Tendenz* was directed by the Christian Social Party. Thus the Catholic youth began to influence the leaders in a continually increasing degree. When they saw that the Heimat-Wehr had become a well-drilled body—this was accomplished in a comparatively short time—they tried to defeat the socialists by military rather than by democratical methods.

When the continual attacks of the Heimat-Wehr had driven back the socialists a little, the Christian Social Party and the Heimat-Wehr wished to alter the Austrian constitution. The constitution of 1919 had divided Austria into nine federal counties or cantons. Vienna is the most important and the most densely inhabited of them, as it is the home of nearly the third part of the population of the country. Moreover, the greater towns were nearly as independent as the federal cantons. The socialists had, as was said above, the majority in the larger towns, in general, and they used their power in a direction directly opposed to the conservative ideals of the Christian Social Party and the Heimat-Wehr. So they tried to weaken the sovereignty of those communities which were known to have a socialistic majority in order to strengthen the central authorities, which were certainly Catholic. The big drive against the socialists

was made at meetings as well as by fights between the Heimat-Wehr and the Schutzbund, and was successful in a high degree. The constitution was, in fact, altered, with the result that the central government could interfere with most of the problems of the towns and the federal cantons. As the central government and the federal president, whose authority had also been increased have been conservative from 1920 until to-day, the altering of the constitution represented a big success for the Catholic party. They had wished, of course, for a greater modification, but they might well be proud of their success, as the opposition of the Social Democratic Party had been really desperate.

But success often induces people to grow incautious and inconsiderate. The leaders of the Heimat-Wehr were young and ambitious men. Every one of them wished to become the "Leader" of Austria, some kind of Austrian Mussolini. Everyone would command, nobody obey. So they began to quarrel and to fight one another. Thus they weakened their military and political power and strengthened the Social Democratic party again. They did not agree any longer with the well-considered policy of the Christian Social Party, which wished for a Catholic and conservative but also democratic Austrian State. The breakdown of discipline among the Heimat-Wehr diminished their influence more and more, so that they lost a great part of their followers. In order to regain their importance, they tried to make a military revolution in Styria, Lower and Upper Austria, and Carinthia on 13 September, 1931. They had the intention of making Austria a Fascist state, similar to Italy. The revolution, however, entirely failed. The troops of the Heimat-Wehr were defeated without bloodshed. The affair did not last longer than half a day. Most of their followers left the Heimat-Wehr after this unsuccessful enterprise.

During this time the Christian Social Party had not been idle. Seeing, naturally, that the Heimat-Wehr was too unreliable and uncertain an organization for Catholic youth, the Christian Social Party founded special new organizations. The new associations, such as the

"Catholic Advancers" and the "*Lueger-Youth*", spread rapidly and succeeded in regenerating the Christian Social Party and making it more attractive to the masses of the population.

In these last years a society called "Freethinkers" had risen, especially among the poorer classes, which aimed at a modification of the material status of the Catholic Church in Austria. All ecclesiastics in Austria are public officials; they are paid from the public budget, which is produced by the taxes and customs which everyone has to pay. There is no injustice here, as may at first appear to foreigners, since 93.86 per cent. of the inhabitants of Austria are Catholics. The freethinkers say, however, that many Austrians are Catholics by baptism only, not by any real faith in their religion. Why should he who never goes to church be compelled to pay, by his taxes, the priests and the bishops, so numerous in Austria? The Catholics answered to this question that it was his own fault if a Catholic did not go to church. Those who do not fulfil their religious duties should not be rewarded for their failure to do so by paying fewer taxes, as the freethinkers would wish. If the laws were altered according to the proposals of the freethinkers, religious people would, in fact, be penalized. It was one of the first successes of the new Youth organizations, that they diminished the influence of the freethinkers among common people. All these organizations became the battlegrounds of modern Catholic youth. There they could display their political abilities. Thus the old leaders of the party saw that there were very many young and able Catholic politicians, and they soon entrusted them with more difficult tasks. After a short time the leader of the "Catholic Advancers", Dr. Schuschnigg, was appointed minister of justice. This fact was the beginning of a new era in Austria. An energetic and somewhat anti-democratic group now became predominant in the Christian Social Party. Many of the old leaders were put aside.

Meanwhile a new political factor had arisen in Austria: the Nazis. When they had become powerful in the "Reich", they tried, according to their principle of

making all Germans Nazis, to convert Austria to their programme. Systematically they tried to conquer Austria. They spent extraordinarily large sums of money for new papers; they fetched a great many political orators from Germany and covered all Austria with their propaganda. About a year ago every citizen of Vienna got, twice or thrice a week, among the letters the postman brought in the morning, some prospectuses or invitations of the Nazis. They held big meetings where their speakers attacked and calumniated both the Christian Social and the Social Democratic Party. The equipment of their military organizations, the S.A. and S.S., as they were called, was excellent, because they got all their weapons and uniforms from the rich Nazis of the "Reich". A great many of unemployed entered the S.A. and S.S., as these troops were extraordinarily well paid. In every large town they built one of their "Brown Houses", which were real fortifications where they had concealed their weapons. Many people who had been formerly followers of the Heimat-Wehr now became active members of the Nazis. The attitude of the Christian Social Party towards the Nazis was not uniform. Some of the Catholic leaders thought it was absolutely necessary for their party to have a military organization against the socialistic Schutzbund; therefore they thought that the S.A. and S.S. were better than nothing. So they wished to be on friendly terms with the Nazis, as the new organizations of the Catholic youth were very useful for propaganda and meetings, although too weak for serious fighting. They were ready to forgive the anti-Catholic speeches of the Nazis if they would only protect them against the attacks of the socialists, hoping that the Nazis would become quieter in time. Another group of Catholics, however, thought that this attitude towards the Nazis would mean setting the fox to keep the geese. They thought the Nazis were quite as dangerous for Catholicism as the socialists. This irresolute attitude of the Christian Social Party was very advantageous for the Nazis, as, although they were continually attacking the Christian Social Party, they themselves were neither attacked nor checked. By their energetic propaganda

they obtained in a comparatively short time a large number of new adherents by whose means they hope to become as powerful in Austria as they are in Germany. The problem of how to deal with the Nazis became one of the most difficult before the Government. The Cabinet was not able to solve it in a satisfying way, so it resigned. A new Cabinet was appointed, of which the Chancellor was Dr. Dollfuss. The figure of Dr. Dollfuss is of so great an importance for Austria that it is worth while to give a short survey of his life.

Dr. Engelbert Dollfuss was born on 4 October, 1892, in Texing, a small village in the district of Manks, Lower Austria. His father was a farmer and his mother is still alive. His brother has remained a farmer until now. He attended the gymnasium—classical school—at Hollabrunn, and, after having obtained the *baccalaureate*, he became a student at the University of Vienna, where he graduated a *doctor juris*. Then he attended the University of Berlin in order to study economics. During the Great War he served as a volunteer thirty-seven months as a full-lieutenant in a regiment from the Tyrol. He was always at the front, receiving many decorations. Having completed his studies, he became secretary of the Society of Farmers of Lower Austria. There he proved so able that he became vice-director and after a short time director of the Agricultural Board of Lower Austria. His extraordinary intelligence, industry, and activity induced the Christian Social Cabinet to make him vice-president of the Federal Railways. Shortly afterwards he became president of the Federal Railways. In this office he proved so able that the attention of the Christian Social leaders was continually turned upon him. On 18 March, 1931, he was appointed—in his thirty-ninth year—Minister of Agriculture. He was one of the best Ministers of Agriculture Austria ever had, but his work in this branch of the Government is relatively unimportant, from the historical point of view, compared with his deeds as Chancellor. He was made Federal Chancellor of Austria on 18 May, 1932. Dr. Dollfuss is married and has two children. He is a very religious Catholic, but he does not make a fuss about it, as many politicians do

nowadays. The Chancellor is not only a good orator and a very clever and skilful politician, but also a man of enormous activity and inflexible energy. Though he is very kind and polite, he has very often succeeded in carrying through his will, when it seemed to be nearly impossible.

It was a very sad time when Dr. Dollfuss began his work. The economic crises of the world had influenced Austria in a high degree. Unemployment had increased in a terrible measure and the economic depression had intensified the cruelty of the political warfare. The leaders of the Nazis had no scruples at all in trying to make political struggles resemble the wars of savage nations. At first, however, the new cabinet was not able to secure good results in politics or economics, as its majority in Parliament was but 83 : 82. Everybody who knows anything about parliamentary life will understand that it is very difficult indeed to pass good laws against so great an opposition. The first success of the new Cabinet was that, at the conference of Lausanne, Dr. Dollfuss got a new loan for his country. The parliamentary opposition did not agree to the conditions of that loan, and the ratification was made after long fights by a one-vote majority. There were people who called the Chancellor a traitor to the German nation, as it was one of the conditions of the loan that Austria should remain independent for a certain time, thereby preventing it from uniting with the Reich. Now, however, those same people realize that that very condition has proved to be most advantageous; the projected union of Germany and Austria is to-day dubbed the "All-German Prison".

Dr. Dollfuss always emphasized that it was absolutely necessary for Austria to live on friendly terms with all the States of the Continent. Therefore he made many journeys to foreign capitals to foster these friendly relations. He strove especially for new economic treaties by which Austrian exports should be increased. All this work was obstructed by the fact that home politics were drifting in a bad direction. The Cabinet fought energetically against the socialists, but it was not very hostile



towards the Nazis, as it hoped the Nazis would in time cease to attack the Christian Social Party and turn all their power against the Social Democratic Party and the Schutzbund as well. The contests between the socialists and the Nazis became so bitter that about a year ago two Nazis and a socialist policeman were shot dead in a fracas. The Cabinet took many measures to bring about the suppression of this terrible custom of deciding political differences by knives or revolvers. These measures were, however, not generally successful. By and by the Nazis became so numerous that they were estimated in the winter of 1932-33 to be about 25 to 30 per cent. of the population. Though that is far from any majority, the great activity of their members made the Nazis very dangerous. The new Christian Social Youth organizations would have fought against the Nazis much more effectively and successfully had it not been for the new influence of the Nazis in the Reich. When Herr Hitler became Chancellor of the Reich and by the success of his movement became master of all Germany, the Austrian Nazis received their greatest stimulant to growth. They asked continually for elections, as they hoped the Cabinet would lose its majority and Dr. Dollfuss would be thus compelled to take the Nazis into his Cabinet. In the meantime the parliamentary situation of the Cabinet had become very bad. The opposition was so powerful that it was nearly impossible to pass any Bill according to the intentions of the Cabinet and the Christian Social Party. The hateful political atmosphere was the real ground why the three Presidents of the Parliament resigned on 4 March, 1933.

Parliament was now not able to meet, as it cannot hold a meeting without a chairman. It could not even meet for the formal election of a new president. When all this happened, most people thought that the Cabinet would ask for legal opinion as to how new presidents could be elected. Dr. Dollfuss, however, did nothing of the kind. On the contrary, the Cabinet published a manifesto to all the people of Austria that it would now, not being checked any longer by parliamentary struggles, try to bring to Austria better times again. The popu-

lation was asked to cease gossiping but to work for Austria and to trust the Cabinet. The legal ground for this semi-dictatorship was the Bill of "Authorization for the Cabinet to make laws in regard to the economical consequences of the Great War", dating from the year 1917, which is, without any doubt, valid to-day. In this way the Cabinet was enabled to make new laws according to its intentions without discussion. At first the socialists fought energetically against this new political method, as they lost their parliamentary influence on the Government, but Dr. Dollfuss turned out to be more powerful, as he would have countered a general strike by joining the Nazis and taking some of them into his Cabinet. On the other hand, the Nazis did not dare to attack him too energetically, in case he took the socialists for allies. By such a clever policy he succeeded in building his dictatorship.

In consequence of all this, the line of action of the Christian Social Party became directly opposed to democracy. The new young leaders of the Christian Social Party were convinced that the attraction of democracy for the masses had diminished. They had seen by some contemporary examples that the Catholic parties had lost a great part of their followers by remaining democrats when the nationalistic and anti-democratic trend of politics became predominant. As they wished Austria to remain a State governed by Catholics, they were ready to abandon democracy. Dr. Dollfuss knew, however, that he could only make his dictatorship a long-lasting institution if he succeeded in fulfilling two conditions. The first of them was the improvement of the economic status of Austria, the second was a good military organization. Otherwise the continual resistance of the socialists could not be finally broken. The most important task of the Cabinet was to alleviate the unemployment. Dr. Dollfuss occupied himself, therefore, with the building of new highroads, the increase of exports, and many other ways of making it possible for more workmen to return to work. The first of the two conditions was fulfilled in a continually increasing degree. But for the second there were many

difficulties, as it was absolutely necessary to fulfil it completely. At first Dr. Dollfuss and his advisers were undecided on the best methods to adopt. The Chancellor began secret discussions with Herr Habicht, the leader of the Austrian Nazis. Dr. Dollfuss proposed to take some Nazis into his Cabinet; they should help him, in return, against the socialists. But Herr Habicht and his party were so ambitious and imperious that it was impossible to come to terms—the Nazis demanded a majority in the Cabinet; besides, news came from the Reich that the Nazis there had imprisoned some Catholic priests for political reasons and had turned out to be very anti-Catholic. So discussions were broken off and, after a short time, published in part by Herr Habicht. The Cabinet, however, united with the remains of the *Heimat-Wehr*. These remains were very small and scanty, but in an astonishingly short time they got a number of new members and the *Heimat-Wehr* became a powerful political factor once more. The Cabinet now worked in a very energetic manner in order to make Austria a State governed according to Catholic and conservative ideals. Many new laws were published, all serving the improvement of the economic situation and the calming of the political differences. Thus the Cabinet fought energetically for better times to come for Austria when it was severely attacked by the Nazis.

The Nazis saw that they had lost their chance. There was already a anti-democratic and anti-socialistic government and they had failed to join it. The new trend of politics threatened to weaken their power. In order to recover their lost influence, they strove for a union of Austria with the Reich. They reminded the Austrian people of the old all-German ideals from the year 1848, and they tried to attack Dr. Dollfuss and his Cabinet with low, vulgar lies and slanders. When the Cabinet announced that it would order energetic measures against the Nazis if they would not cease attacking the Cabinet and its leader and the Christian Social Party in this underhand way, the Nazis answered by inducing their German friends to order that every German who went to Austria had to pay one thousand marks—that is about seventy

pounds—no matter how many days he intended to spend in Austria. That was a terrible blow, as the foreign visitors are essential for the Austrian national income. The German visitors in particular had always formed the majority of foreign visitors and had brought much money into the country. A party taking this line of treachery to Austrian interests was naturally proscribed. Nazi newspapers were suspended and the wearing of the Swastika was prohibited. The Nazis tried to regain their influence and to overcome Dr. Dollfuss in two ways. They terrorized Austria and tried to show thus that the country would not be safe so long as Dr. Dollfuss and the Christian Social Party were in power. The S.S., which, as it has been said above, is their military organization, became terroristic. Their first act of terrorism was the throwing of a bomb into the shop of a Jewish jeweller, by which two men were killed and several other people seriously wounded. Many telegraph wires were cut and they tried to blow up aqueducts. On the other hand they sent aeroplanes from Bavaria which threw down papers covered with insults against the Austrian Cabinet. The German broadcasting stations transmitted frequently extraordinarily vulgar speeches against Austria and Dr. Dollfuss. All these efforts did not have any effect, as all the sympathies of the great foreign powers turned to Austria. The terrorists in the country were put down after a short time by the brave work of the police.

A new movement was founded, called the "Patriotic Front", which is to contain all people who wish Austria an independent and authoritatively governed State according to Catholic principles. The leader of it is Dr. Dollfuss. The greatest success of the Patriotic Front was the "General Meeting of Catholics" in Vienna in the beginning of September. More than a hundred thousand Catholics came to Vienna in order to celebrate the 250th anniversary of the victory over the Turks and the advance of the Catholic idea in 1683. Five cardinals attended the meeting, and the Holy Father himself sent a message. It was a most beautiful festival. Though the new concordat between Austria and the Vatican is not yet published, it is understood that the

Pope approves of Dr. Dollfuss' policy. In his great speech delivered to the assembly of the League of Nations, the Chancellor emphasized with the applause of all the statesmen who listened that Austria had the intention of regulating her social problems according to the recent Encyclical of Pius XI. It is the best expression of the new trend of Austria, that it is to be built according to the ideals of the Roman Catholic Church.

A few months ago a Nazi shot at Dr. Dollfuss, but the bullet was diverted by a metal button of the Chancellor's coat and he was saved. On this occasion he showed a calmness and a self-control which were really admirable. All the states of Europe congratulated him on his escape, and showed thus again their sympathy for Austria. Even the leader of the socialists, Herr Seitz, came to express his good wishes for his wounded adversary. After a short time the Chancellor was restored to health, and it may be hoped that this attempt will be the last ever made by the Nazis against Austria. So may her future be more happy than her past.

DANUBIANUS.

#### ART. 4.—THE PROBLEMS OF THE SPIRITUAL CANTICLE

THE arduous labours of Dom Philippe Chevallier, monk of Solesmes, which now stretch over a period of twelve years so far as published results go, labours carried out with all the patience, perseverance, and tenacity of the great scholars of St. Maur, have done much to illuminate the problems connected with this divine Song and its commentary. Following upon his weighty articles in the *Bulletin Hispanique*\* and *La Vie Spirituelle*,† he in 1930 gave to the world a fine critical edition of the first version of the Canticle‡ in which is set forth the nearest possible approach to the text as it left the Saint's hands that we can hope to arrive at in the absence of the original MS. The critical apparatus is extraordinarily minute and elaborate. Between MSS. and early printed books there are twenty-six surviving witnesses to the Spiritual Canticle. In the fifteen most relevant of these witnesses Dom Chevallier has noted the huge tale of more than 80,000 variants. Such heroic and patient labours strike dumb the ordinary artisan, if with admiration yet also with stupefaction. But there is no space here to enter on the minutiae of textual criticism.

Throughout the Spanish text Dom Chevallier has wisely modernized the spelling. To what end reproduce divergencies of spelling in documents of an age when spelling had not yet become fixed? We should have the incongruity of a word in the text being spelt in one way, and in the variants at foot in another! But he has scrupulously preserved words which have become obsolete

\* "Le Cantique spirituel de Saint Jean de la Croix a-t-il été interpolé?" *Bulletin Hisp.*, 1922, vol. iv, pp. 307-342.

† *La Vie Spirituelle*, vol. xiv, July-Aug. 1926, suppl. pp. [109]-[162]; vol. xv, Jan. 1927, pp. [69]-[109]. The following published since the completion of the book: vol. xxii, Jan. 1930, pp. [1]-[11]; vol. xxii, Feb. 1930, pp. [80]-[90]; vol. xxviii, July 1931, pp. [29]-[50].

‡ *Le Cantique Spirituel de Saint Jean de la Croix Docteur de l'Eglise*. Notes historiques, Texte critique, Version française. "Hacemos una pifia." Paris, Desclée, De Brouwer, 1930. Introd. pp. i-cvii. The entire volume, pp. 770.

NOTE. There are two versions of the Spiritual Canticle. I refer to the first as A, to the second as B. In quoting the stanzas I use ordinary numerals for A and Roman numerals for B.



## 44      The Problems of the Spiritual Cantic

and constructions which are out of date. Dom Chevallier is nothing if not scientific : his text is wholly and entirely without any sign of punctuation. Père Joseph de Guibert in a very laudatory and instructive review of the book\* gently protests against such scrupulous nicety. But leaving aside all questions of scientific construction, I can certainly testify that to read a work of deeply mystical import in a sonorous and moving language not one's own without the help of so much as a comma is a very salutary and exhilarating adventure. Double is the attention required in the reading, and double the harvest gleaned by the labour. No better exercise could be devised for getting deep down into the book. And in defence of Dom Chevallier I say that punctuation is after all a very influential form of interpretation; there is little of it in the MSS. he has used, and there is no guarantee at all that these copies reproduce the Saint's punctuation, whatever the value of that may have been. A comma, or the absence of it, may work great mischief and obscure the sublimest thought. Take an instance in this very Cantic (A 17 ; B xxvi) :

*En la interior bodega  
De mi Amado bebí*

In the inner cellar  
Of my Beloved did I drink

A comma after cellar is necessary to bring out the deep mystical sense of this line and a half. The meaning is not the vague statement, "I drank in the inner cellar of my Beloved", but, "Of my Beloved did I drink in the inner cellar." The sense is after the manner of Holy Communion. It is as if a communicant in one of the Uniat Churches were to exclaim : "Before the Altar of my Lord did I drink of my Beloved !"

It is curious how translators and editors leave unpunctuated, or otherwise imperfectly present, this line and a half, the meaning of which is very clearly

\* In the *Gregorianum*, Apl.-June 1931, xii, pp. 327-333. Reproduced in the *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, xii, 1931, pp. 241-246.

## The Problems of the Spiritual Canticle 45

explained by the Saint in the ensuing commentary. The Spanish editors, Padre Silverio and Padre Gerardo, each, in both versions, omit the illuminating comma, as do Fr. Alessandro di San Francesco in the old Italian translation, Canon Hoornaert and the Carmelite Nuns of Paris in French translations, and Pater Henricus a Sancta Familia, O.C.D., in his Flemish version. Strangely enough the mystically minded Cardinal Diepenbrock, author of a once valued edition of the works of the Bl. Henry Suso, is unequivocally material :

In meines Liebsten Keller  
War ich und trank\*

On the other hand Fr. Marco di San Francesco (1747) is exact in his rendering :

Nella più interna cella  
Io bevei dell' Amato

In the only other translation to which I can refer at the moment, that of Pater Aloysius, O.C.D., in the beautiful Theatiner-Verlag edition of the Saint's works, vol. iv, p. 17, the mystical meaning is brought out with all the needed emphasis :

Im innern Keller des Geliebten mein  
Trank ich *von ihm*

Dom Chevallier has also banned all capitals from his text. Père de Guibert protests against this also. Of course a capital at the beginning of a sentence would be interpretative, and doubly so : it would indicate the end of one sentence and the beginning of another. But though I am convinced that a scholar of the calibre of Dom Chevallier best knows his own business, I can think of no reason why capital letters should not have been allowed for the *proper names*. The absence of these is a slight discomfort and a trifling distraction. But the oriental King and Seer, job, deprived of his capital,

\* *Geistlicher Blumenstrauß*, 4th edition, 1862, p. 170.

## 46 The Problems of the Spiritual Canticale

with his rather odd and ultra-British appearance, provided a moment of relaxation in these somewhat arduous studies. Still, when all is said and done, this wonderful book contains within itself a remedy for any discomfort caused by the want of stops or capitals, for opposite every page of the Spanish text is Dom Chevallier's literal French translation of prose and verse with punctuation, capitals, scripture references, all the supports and props, that is, that the least adventurous explorer could desire.

St. John composed thirty out of the thirty-nine verses of his Canticale in 1578 while imprisoned in the Carmelite house of Toledo. I do not say wrote, because he was without pen, ink, or paper until towards the end of his nine months' captivity. He then wrote down these and other verses which he had kept in memory, and brought them away with him on his supernatural delivery from his prison-house. Towards the end of 1578 he was appointed superior of the hermitage of the Calvario in Andalusia. This was situated within a walking distance of the Carmelite Nunnery of Beas. The Prioress of Beas was Anne of Jesus, perhaps the greatest and most inspiring of St. Theresa's many great daughters. At St. Theresa's instigation St. John used to go over once a week to Beas to confess the nuns and instruct them in the inner mysteries of the life of union. By way of religious instruction he used at times to repeat some of the verses of the Canticale to the nuns, adding an explanation of their inner meaning.

In June 1579 St. John was appointed rector of the Carmelite College of Baeza, still in Andalusia, but too far from Beas to make regular visits practicable. There he finished, at different times, the remaining nine verses of his Song. Anne of Jesus had asked him to write a commentary on the whole Canticale, for who could fathom its mysteries without explanation? Without a key it is as sealed a book as is King Solomon's Canticale of Canticles. He fulfilled her request in 1584 when Prior of Granada, sending her the MS.

Anne of Jesus went to France in 1604 to establish the Order of Discalced Carmelite nuns in that Kingdom.

In 1607 she went on to Brussels at the request of the Regent Isabel, a daughter of Philip II, so as to settle her nuns in the Spanish Netherlands also. Without doubt she brought the original of the commentary, or a copy of it, both to France and the Low Countries. Neither the first edition of the works of St. John of the Cross (Alcalá, 1618), nor the second (Barcelona, 1619), contained the Spiritual Canticle. The first edition of that work was a French translation by René Gaultier, conseiller du roi, published at Paris in 1622. Gaultier was well known to Anne of Jesus, and had helped effectively in starting the Discalced Carmelite nuns in France. No question, then, but that he translated from a MS. given or lent him by Anne. When she died in 1621, the Regent Isabel had the Canticle in the original Spanish published at Brussels in her friend's honour in 1627. Again, without any doubt, the MS. in Anne's possession was the source of this version. This was the first real edition of the Canticle in its beautiful native language. In the same year, but a little earlier, there appeared at Rome an Italian translation by Fr. Alessandro di San Francesco. The translation can only have been made from a MS. sent from Madrid. It differs from the above two publications in having forty stanzas instead of thirty-nine. The new stanza, *descubre tu presencia*, figures as stanza xi.

At length, at Madrid in 1630, there appeared an edition—the third—of St. John's works, this time including the Spiritual Canticle. It, too, contains stanza No. 11, but in other respects observes the same order in the stanzas as Brussels 1627. From this time on till the end of the seventeenth century all editions of the works of St. John of the Cross—seven in number—follow Madrid 1630 as far as the Canticle is concerned.

There appeared at Seville in 1703, handsomely produced, and with a considerable flourish of editorial trumpets, an entirely new version of the Spiritual Canticle (B). It professed to have been taken from the original MS. written for Anne, which had lain hidden in the Nunnery at Jaén for 120 years or so. This is the version which, eventually, conquered all along the line to the

## 48      The Problems of the Spiritual Cantic

exclusion of A : it is the version known to English readers in David Lewis' admirable translation. The editor of 1703, Fray Andrés de Jesús, dismisses its predecessors with contempt. The possibility of there being two versions both written by the Saint does not seem to have occurred to anyone till the middle of the eighteenth century, when we know that the celebrated and scholarly Fray Andrés de la Encarnación suggested the likelihood, though his views were never made public. A was now simply regarded as a vicious and faulty abridgement of B, full of suppressions, additions, omissions, changes, and—worst crime of all perhaps—with its stanzas entirely out of their proper order ! It was not till the publication of Padre Gerardo's critical edition of the works of St. John of the Cross, Toledo, 1912-1914, which reproduced the two versions, that the claim was put forth that both A and B were the genuine handiwork of St. John, and it was inevitable that the greater authenticity of A should become evident to all impartial students. The proud vaunt that B was in the handwriting of the Saint has received its quietus, and will never trouble us more, and a certificate of authenticity on the Jaén codex does not stand the test of scientific criticism. So far from B having been pruned down into a stunted version of the work, it is the compiler of B who has inserted his additions in A. Upon an estimate made for me there are some 79,000 words in B as it stands, of which B's contribution amounts to, say, 28,000 words. Therefore the contribution of A is nearly double that of B. Dom Chevallier goes so far as to reject the whole of B's contribution. But as a whole, I venture to think, this has not yet been proved.

Padre Gerardo (E.C., vol. ii, pp. 493-613) published a very old and interesting example of the first version (A) from a MS. in possession of the Carmelite nuns of Sanlúcar de Barrameda.\* It is enriched by marginal notes and interlineations said to be in the handwriting of St. John. An expert in handwriting has gone into the matter for Dom Chevallier, and inclines rather strongly to the belief that these notes have not been written by the Saint. But he adds the caution : "Un très prudent

\* Reproduced in phototype by P. Silverio, O.C.D., Burgos, 1928, 2 vols.

reserve s'impose" (LVS, xxii, Jan. 1930, p. [9]). On the other hand Père Louis de la Trinité\* has invoked the aid of two experts who declare for the authenticity of the marginal and interlineal additions. Handwriting, I fear, can hardly solve this problem: the margins and spaces between lines do not admit of the Saint writing with freedom in his natural hand. The problem is further complicated by an endorsement on the face of the Sanlúcar MS. signed John of the Cross, stating that this MS. is a rough draft (*Borrador*) of which a fair copy has already been made. This is a vague statement from which no clear sense can with certainty be derived. Both Dom Chevallier and Dr. Baruzi cast doubt upon its genuineness and dispute the authenticity of the signature.†

The following Table now becomes necessary for a proper understanding of some rather complicated details:

	<i>A compared with B</i>				<i>B compared with A</i>			
Bride	1	.	.	.	i	.	.	1
	2	.	.	.	ii	.	.	2
	3	.	.	.	iii	.	.	3
	4	.	.	.	iv	.	.	4
Creatures	5	.	.	.	v	.	.	5
Bride	6	.	.	.	vi	.	.	6
	7	.	.	.	vii	.	.	7
	8	.	.	.	viii	.	.	8
	9	.	.	.	ix	.	.	9
	10	.	.	.	x	.	.	10
	—	.	.	.	xi	.	.	—
	11	.	.	.	xii	.	.	11
Bridegroom	12	Sp. Betr.						
		proclaimed	.	xiii	xiii	Sp. Betrothal		12
Bride	13	.	.	.	xiv	.	.	13
	14	.	.	.	xv	.	.	14
	15	.	.	.	xxiv	.	.	25
	16	.	.	.	xxv	.	.	26
	17	Sp. Marr. takes						
		place	.	xxvi	xviii	.	.	31
	18	.	.	.	xix	.	.	32
	19	.	.	.	xx	.	.	29
	20	.	.	.	xxi	.	.	30

\* Père Louis de la Trinité, O.C.D., one of the ablest writers of the French Carmelite school. He has in a marked degree the gift of clear and attractive exposition. I recommend the reader desirous of a full statement of the existing problems to read three articles by him published in the *Etudes Carmélitaines* for October 1931, and April and October 1932, embracing altogether some 83 pages.

† *Saint Jean de la Croix*, Paris, 2nd edition, pp. 16-28. A brief but noteworthy contribution to the discussion.



## 50      The Problems of the Spiritual Canticle

		<i>A compared with B</i>		<i>B compared with A</i>	
Bride	21	.	xxx	xxii	Sp. Marriage
	22	.	xxxi	xxiii	
	23	.	xxxii	xxiv	
	24	.	xxxiii	xxv	
	25	.	xvi	xxvi	
	26	.	xvii	xxvii	
Bridegroom	27	Sp. Marr. proclaimed			
		.	xxii	xxviii	
	28	.	xxiii	xxix	
	29	.	xx	xxx	
Bride	30	.	xxi	xxxi	
	31	.	xviii	xxxii	
Bridegroom	32	.	xix	xxxiii	
	33	.	xxxiv	xxxiv	
Bride	34	.	xxxv	xxxv	Beatific Vision
	35	.	xxxvi	xxxvi	
	36	.	xxxvii	xxxvii	
	37	.	xxxviii	xxxviii	
	38	.	xxxix	xxxix	
	39	.	xl	xl	

St. John of the Cross wrote the Canticle without any thought of making it known to others. It is an autobiography, the autobiography of a soul, perhaps the only autobiography ever written without the use of the personal pronoun, and it enshrines, for himself only, the experiences and the norm which had led him to divine union. Dom Chevallier has well said that it expresses before God, and for God alone, the case of a soul alone with God.\* Since there is system in it right throughout, and the argument is divine, and the movement progressive, it is difficult to suppose that he should ever have changed the position of the stanzas. Yet B in the Spiritual Marriage has a row of ten stanzas (xxiv-xxxiii) which A has in the Spiritual Betrothal (16-25), and four in the Spiritual Betrothal (xviii-xxi) which A has in the Spiritual Marriage (30-33). If St. John really wrote the additions to A which go to make up B, how account for the transposition of the stanzas? The compiler of B shows a singular clumsiness and unfamiliarity with the work in various references which the text makes to foregoing stanzas. For example, in the *Declaración* of stanza xviii (A 31) there is mention of "the two preceding stanzas". But the two preceding stanzas are not xvi and xvii, but 29 and 30. Lewis, in despair, here, as in other cases,

\* "Il a traduit devant Dieu seul et pour Dieu seul, le cas d'une âme seule avec Dieu." *Introd.*, p. lvii.

suppresses altogether these erroneous references to preceding stanzas which do not fit : in stanza xxiv he even resorts to a neat but quite unwarranted evasion by talking of "two of the foregoing stanzas" instead of "the two foregoing"! But the transposition which seems to me most of all unlike St. John is that the two concluding stanzas of the Spiritual Marriage, 29 and 30, as written by him in the dark prison-house of Toledo, are taken out of the Spiritual Marriage and given to the Spiritual Betrothal under xx and xxi. Is it likely that the two stanzas which represented to him a climax in his spiritual life should by his act have been removed from the place which had been chosen for them under an inspiration veritably divine?

St. John has an eminently orderly mind : consistency presides over his actions and writings. And yet there are two, or two or three, stanzas in the arrangement made by himself that appear quite out of their place. And especially stanza 17 which stands in the Spiritual Betrothal and yet roundly and unequivocally sings of the Spiritual Marriage. By the compiler of B it has indeed been placed as stanza xxvi in the Spiritual Marriage, and on the face of it he would seem to have effected an improvement. The Saint begins his commentary on this stanza on a very high and solemn note :

In order to explain in any degree the meaning of this ["in the inner cellar"], I have need of the special help of the Holy Ghost to direct my hand and guide my pen. The cellar is the highest degree of love to which the soul may attain in this life. . . . The last and inmost cellar is entered by few in this world, because therein is wrought the perfect union with God, the union of the Spiritual Marriage, *of which the soul is now speaking*. . . . In this transformation the soul drinks of God in its very substance and its spiritual powers.

The following stanza, 18 (xxvii), recounts what took place *allí*, that is in the inner cellar : therefore this stanza must also refer to the Spiritual Marriage. It is true that the stanza ends, "there I promised to be his bride" : but this could here refer equally to a betrothal or to holy wedlock. The Spanish word used in the commentary is

## 52 The Problems of the Spiritual Cantic

*desposorio*, and the Dictionary of the Spanish Academy gives two very different significations to it, namely: "A mutual promise between man and woman to contract matrimony; or more particularly a marriage *per verba de presenti*".\*

Is there then no way out of this seeming imbroglio? Shall we be obliged to consider that a great Doctor of the Church, so systematic in his formal treatises, yet slipped unaccountably in expounding a mystical Cantic? An unknown witness from a dim past holds out a glimmer of an explanation, and on this I seize eagerly. In the Grande Chartreuse at Farneta near Lucca, where in years gone by I have sometimes been a privileged visitor, there is a copy of the Madrid 1672 edition of the works of St. John of the Cross. In a handwriting of the period there are some notes against certain stanzas of the Cantic showing that the writer felt my trouble about stanza 17.

Against stanza No. 1 he writes:

*Empieça la union sencilla o primeros actos de ella i celebrese en la Canción :†*

Simple union or the first acts of it is begun, and it is celebrated in stanza 13 (12).

Against stanza 13:

*Celebrasse la union o primeros actos de ella en esta canción. Empieça el desposorio espiritual q̄ celebrese en el canción 18:*

This stanza celebrates the union or first acts of union. The Spiritual Betrothal begins which is celebrated in stanza 18 (17).

Against stanza 18 (17):

*Celebrasse el esposorio espiritual en esta Canción 18 y luego empieza el matrimonio espiritual o unión real consumada pero no se celebra asta la Canción 28:*

The Spiritual Betrothal is celebrated in this stanza and the Spiritual Marriage or real consummated union begins immediately but is not celebrated till stanza 28 (27).

\* Promesa mutua que el hombre y la mujer se hacen de contraer matrimonio; y más especialmente, casamiento por palabras de presente."

† He is using the numeration of Madrid 1630 with its forty stanzas, which is consequently one ahead after stanza 10.

Against stanza 28 (27):

*Consumase el matrimonio espiritual. Unión total consumada y trasformada :*

The Spiritual Marriage is consummated. Total union consummated and transformed.

Here, in stanza 17, it is certainly question of a veritable marriage, as is plainly indicated by the Saint in his commentary. And this shadowy witness from the past has fully realized it. The marriage, he says, takes place in 17, but is not celebrated till 27. I am of the opinion that he intended to convey that, though it took place in 17, it was not proclaimed till 27. This contention is supported by one of the annotations on the Sanlúcar MS. made by the Saint to stanza 27, namely :

Hence it still remained to the Bridegroom *to make mention of the Spiritual Marriage* between the soul and the Son of God, her Bridegroom, which is much more than the Betrothal.

Though we may not in such studies allow ourselves to be influenced merely because a thing is fitting, yet because this annotation would explain a seeming inconsistency in the work of a Saint and Doctor, it is entitled to full consideration. In the ceremony or proclamation of the Spiritual Betrothal (12/xiii) it is the Bridegroom who speaks, in that of the first mention of the Spiritual Marriage (17/xxvi) it is the Bride. A confirmation by the voice of the Bridegroom is natural, and this we get in 27/xxii. If my witness from the past has divined a correct explanation of the Saint's seeming inattention, we should in future have to consider that the actual Spiritual Marriage took place ten stanzas earlier than has generally been supposed. There is nothing in the commentary of these ten stanzas (17-24/xxvi-xxxiii and 25-26/xvi-xvii) which is in any way inconsistent with the Spiritual Marriage, and it is a point in the rearrangement of B well worth noting that all these stanzas save xvi-xvii have been transferred by the compiler of B to the Spiritual Marriage. Nor is there any objection to the brevity of the Betrothal : it speaks all the more eloquently of God's love for this soul !

## 54 The Problems of the Spiritual Canticle

There are so many fine things among the additions to the commentary of B, things so characteristically Juanine, that this aspect of the problem deserves a fuller consideration than it has hitherto received. In support of this claim I give one striking specimen, having no space for more :\*

Observe, however, that if the soul has not reached the state of unitive love, it is necessary for it to make acts of love, as well in the active as the contemplative life. But when it has reached this state, it is not expedient that it should occupy itself in other and exterior duties, *unless they be matters of obligation*,† which might hinder, were it but for a moment, the life of love in God, though they may minister greatly to His service ; because an instant of pure love is more precious in the eyes of God and the soul, and more profitable to the Church, than all other good works together, though it may seem as if nothing were done. . . . When the soul, then, in any degree possesses the spirit of solitary love, we must not interfere with it. We should inflict a grievous wrong upon it, and upon the Church also, if we were to occupy it, were it only for a moment, in exterior or active duties, however important they might be. . . . Let those men of zeal, who think by their preaching and exterior works to convert the world, consider that they would be much more edifying to the Church, and more pleasing unto God—setting aside the good example they would give—if they would spend at least one half of their time with God in prayer, even though they may not have attained to the state of unitive love. Certainly they would then do more, and with less labour, by this one good work than by a thousand others, because of the merit of their prayer and the spiritual strength it supplies. To act otherwise is to beat the air, to do little more than nothing, sometimes nothing, and sometimes even harm.‡

What then is the mystery of B ? If entirely the work

\* Lewis, Note preceding stanza xxix. Edition of 1919, p. 223, §2. I quote and refer to Lewis from time to time for the convenience of English readers.

† The Editor of Seville, 1703, has himself inserted and passed off as the original words of the saintly writer the phrase underlined, possibly with the intention of trying to soften a little the ultra-sublimity of the doctrine. What banality ! As if the author of so perfect and orthodox an exposition would counsel people to shirk the obligations to which they were bound.

‡ Meister Eckhart spricht : "Meine nicht Heiligkeit zu setzen in ein *Tun* : man soll Heiligkeit setzen in ein *Sein*. Denn nicht die Werke heiligen uns, sondern wir sollen die Werke heilig machen." Karrer, *System*, Munich, p. 157.

of an alien hand, what was the object in putting it together? When the *Spiritual Canticle* was first published under the auspices of the Order in 1630, why was A selected rather than B? Nine MSS. of B are still forthcoming, and there must have been a considerable number in existence in the first decades of the seventeenth century. This second version was well enough known to the Order: stanza xi with its commentary was taken from it word for word for insertion in the Madrid 1630 edition and the Rome 1627 translation. There is no convincing answer yet to these questions.

An entirely new feature in B, wholly wanting in A, is the "Argument" which precedes the commentary. It runs as follows:

These stanzas describe the career of a soul from its first entrance on the service of God till it comes to the final state of perfection—the *Spiritual Marriage*. They refer accordingly to the three states or ways of the spiritual exercise through which the soul passes before it can arrive at the blessed state—the purgative, the illuminative and the unitive ways, some properties and effects of which they explain.

The first stanzas relate to beginners, which is the purgative way. The second series relate to the advanced in which the *Spiritual Betrothal* takes place: that is the illuminative way. The next relate to the unitive way, in which the *Spiritual Marriage* takes place. The unitive way, that of the perfect, follows the illuminative, which is that of the advanced. The last stanzas treat of the *Beatific State*, the only one to which the soul in that perfect state aspires.

The Argument, with its conventional divisions, is in part at least inapplicable to A. The purifications have already been passed through when the great Song begins. One last bitter affliction still awaits the soul: the Beloved has not shown Himself at the expected time when all had been made ready for him, and the *Canticle* opens with the anguished plaint:

Where hast Thou hidden Thyself  
And abandoned me in my groaning, O my Beloved!

The lament continues, and the affliction at the absence of the Beloved persists until stanza 12/xiii, when the



## 56      The Problems of the Spiritual Canticle

Spiritual Betrothal, the first degree of union, takes place. The "beginners" to whom the Argument alludes are expressly excluded by the Saint in the noble and illuminating Prologue with which he presents the work to Anne of Jesus.

I shall, however [he says], pass over the more ordinary [points and effects of prayer] and treat briefly of the more extraordinary to which they are subject who, by the mercy of God, have advanced beyond the state of beginners. This I do for two reasons: the first is that much has already been written for beginners; and the second is, because I am addressing your Reverence whom Our Lord by His Grace hath brought forth from these beginnings and drawn inwards into the bosom of His divine Love.

The Canticle only deals with two states, both unitive, the Spiritual Betrothal and the Spiritual Marriage. The Argument professes to deal with two others, the Purgative which is of this world, and the Beatific Vision which is of the next. The Canticle judged by the commentary of its first version dealt with neither the one nor the other. It is quite evident that St. John of the Cross could never have brought himself to apply verses, which the Argument would have it relate to the Purifications, to a subject which on the face of them had no suitability at all for the purpose. On this ground alone we must regard the Argument as apocryphal.\* But though the Saint did not introduce the subject of the Beatific Vision into his first commentary, there would I think be nothing unsuitable in his having done so with the verses as they stand, always provided that he had not abandoned the doctrine of the equality of love. The Spiritual Marriage and the Beatific Vision are closely allied. Enjoyment of the one is the surest pledge of the realization of the other.

Dom Chevallier adduces a much stronger and more important change in doctrine as between A and B. In 37/xxxviii St. John deals with the sublime subject of the equality of love which, he says, the soul naturally and supernaturally desires, because the lover cannot be content

\* See Chevallier : *Cantique Spirituel*, pp. lxxv-lxxxviii.

unless he is loved as much as he loves. God loves all men more than they love Him : how then can man hope to love God with the same strength and intensity as God loves him ? In this way : by a rare privilege granted to a very few chosen ones, man's will, by a complete transformation in, and supernatural union with, God's will, becomes the will of God, and since the will is the seat of love, he loves with a divine strength and intensity equal to that with which God loves him. "And thus", he says, "the soul here loves God as much as it is loved by Him, for one and the same love is the love of both." So intense is this love, so unparalleled the experience, that it may at first seem to the soul that it is experiencing the strength and intensity with which God *loves Himself*. The Saint says so in so many words, "which is to love God completely with the same love with which He loves Himself". The same kind in fruition perhaps, but not love the same in strength and intensity, and St. John immediately qualifies, adding : "This cannot be in this life, although in the state of perfection, that is of the Spiritual Marriage, it can take place in a certain way." This is not altogether clear to the ordinary wayfarer ; the Saint has seen it himself, for he has added a precious note to the Sanlúcar MS. which reads : "I do not wish to say that the soul will love God *as much as He loves Himself*, for that cannot be, but only that she loves Him as much as He loves her." This is the true doctrine of the equality of love, and who can doubt that the priceless note is by himself and nobody else ? Is not indeed the very appositeness of this note such as to authenticate all the rest ?

This sublime doctrine, the last word in the ennoblement of man upon earth—*et dixi : Dii estis*—is wanting in B ; more than that, it is denied by B. The writer admits that man aims at this equality of love, but cannot attain to it on earth, and therefore longs for the Beatific Vision in heaven where it shall be realized (Lewis, xxxviii, § 2). Monsieur Maritain points out that B has left standing in earlier chapters (stanzas xxii, Lewis § 10, and xxiv, § 7) passages from A which imply belief in the doctrine. He indicates yet another passage in which B makes his sole original contribution to the doctrine (Lewis, "Note"

## 58 The Problems of the Spiritual Canticle

preceding stanza xxviii). Is it not possible that all these three passages refer to a status of equality, an adoption conferred by the love of God, a patent of the nobility of the soul so to speak, rather than to the equal strength and intensity of the love of lover and beloved? This is merely a tentative conjecture put forward by a diffident and cautious layman, only too conscious of the immeasurableness of the heights and the dizziness of the depths with which he is now encompassed. These passages at least contain nothing like a formal exposition of the doctrine of the equality of love. To know what St. John thought on the subject, we must look to stanza 37 of the First Version: in the Second Version it has wholly vanished in the resplendent glories of the Beatific Vision.\* One thing is certain with the certainty that mathematics furnish, that when St. John wrote the Canticle itself, and in 1584, mature in judgment and experience, the commentary on it for that blessed lady, Anne of Jesus, there was no thought in his mind of including the Beatific Vision in it: the Spiritual Marriage upon earth, the equality of love, which he had experienced, were to him the absorbing wonder.

As will be seen, difficult and arduous problems regarding the Spiritual Canticle still remain without solution. But it is a deep satisfaction to know that scholars of great competence are at work with a will to resolve them, and we look forward eagerly to the day when we may no longer be left in doubt as to what are, and what are not, genuine portions of a work attributed to one of the greatest of the Doctors of the Church.

MONTGOMERY CARMICHAEL.

\* See Silverio, *Obras*, III, pp. 168; 135, 323; 82, 331; 357: Gerardo *Obras*, II, 602-606: Chevallier, *LVS*, xxviii, 1931, pp. [28]-[50]: Jacques Maritain, *Études Carmélitaines*, April 1931, p. 75 n., and April 1932, pp. 1-18: Père Louis de la Trinité, *ibid.*, October 1932, p. 132 et seq.

## ART. 5.—THE HISTORICITY OF ORPHEUS

CATHOLICS who have explored the labyrinth of the Roman catacombs may have noticed on the walls representations of Orpheus taming the wild beasts with his lyre, and have recognized that these are symbols of the peaceful sway of Our Lord ; and it is a well-known fact that early Christian art finally transformed Orpheus into the Good Shepherd. Some will doubtless be aware that there is in the Berlin Museum a gem of a signet-ring showing a human figure on a cross—a replica of the ordinary representation of the Crucifixion—with the inscription, in Greek lettering, *Orpheos Bakkikos*. One's natural impulse is to regard these facts as merely exemplifying the early Christian habit of adapting pagan mythology to Christian uses, which we see for instance in the drawings of Odysseus turning a deaf ear to the Sirens, symbolizing the Christian stand against temptation, also found in the catacombs. One might take the undoubted identification of Orpheus with Our Lord on the Berlin gem simply as another piece of evidence for the view, on other grounds very acceptable, that many of the early Greek converts to Christianity had previously been Orphics, i.e. members of the Greek sect which took religion most seriously, whose conversion was therefore natural. Doubtless no further significance can justifiably be extracted from the portrayals of Orpheus in early Christian art, taken by themselves ; but if, with interest thereby aroused, one pursues the question further, one may very well conclude that these early Greek Christians were expressing perhaps more truth than they knew. The purpose of this article is to put forward what the writer considers strong evidence for the view that Orpheus was no mere figure in a fairy-tale, but an historical character ; no ordinary historical character, but a maker of history ; and no ordinary "maker of history", but in very truth a vehicle of revelation, and in a real sense a forerunner of Our Lord, not unworthy to be compared with the prophets of the Old Testament, and to be treated as he was treated by the early Church, as a type of Our Lord.

Catholics will perhaps be induced to look less askance at this theory than they might otherwise be inclined to do if they are reminded that it is not new, but has authority in the Christian Fathers. It is true that classical scholars have discounted such testimony as late and biased, but the writer holds that this is a case comparable to many which have come to light in recent years, where scepticism has demonstrably overshot itself. The Fathers Cyril,\* Theophilus,† and the writer of the *Cohortatio ad Gentiles*,‡ formerly attributed to Justin, all say that Orpheus, from being a rank polytheist—Theophilus attributes to him three hundred and sixty-five gods, and the pseudo-Justin calls him the founder of Greek polytheism—became a monotheist and a “follower of the true way”. In support of this contention they quote a document in hexameter verses which they call the *Testaments*. One of the several versions of the *Testaments* quoted by early Christian writers, viz. that given by Aristobulus in Eusebius’ *Praeparatio Evangelica*,§ mentions Abraham under the description, “an only-begotten offshoot of the tribe of the Chaldeans long ago”; and for this and other reasons classical scholars have taken the *Testaments* to be of Christian origin, and therefore irrelevant as evidence about Orpheus. Doubtless the reference to Abraham was interpolated into Aristobulus’ version in the Christian era, but the document in main outline goes back at least to the time of Plato. All the versions begin with the hexameter line:

I will speak to those to whom it is right to speak, and do ye, O profane ones, close the doors.

This line is indisputably alluded to in the *Symposium*|| of Plato, in the passage where the servants and other “profane” persons are bidden to “close the doors of their ears”. It may be argued by sceptical scholars that Plato was merely quoting a general invitation to the profane to stand aloof from esoteric mysteries, and that the words afterwards became attached to the Orphic

\* *Contra Julianum*, i, 25.

† c. 15, p. 15c-16a (iii).

† *Ad Autolycum*, iii, 2, p. 117c.

§ xiii, 12.

|| 218 B.

*Testaments*. But the words of Plato are practically identical with the first line of the *Testaments*, and this line, though found at the head of several versions of the Orphic work, is not found elsewhere. Plato therefore must be definitely quoting from the Orphic work, and the work in some form must go back to his day. It is of no consequence in what form exactly it existed in Plato's day, once we have proved that it did exist, for there is nothing else in the *Testaments* but the doctrine of the Oneness of God. From a mass of matter we may quote :\*

Look upon the sole Lord of the world. One He is, self-born :  
all things are fashioned as the offspring of One.

So the doctrine of the Oneness of God was taught by Orphism at least as early as Plato's day.

There is no need, however, to stop at Plato's day. The doctrine goes back much earlier. Consider the following passage† of the *Laws* of Plato :

God, as the old tradition says, holding the beginning and the ending and the middle of all things, by a straight path accomplishes His end, travelling according to nature.

The scholiast comments, "He speaks of the old Orphic tradition", and quotes a couplet of the same tenor as the words of Plato. It is relevant to mention that the scholiast's interpretation of the allusion, in itself thoroughly probable, is confirmed by the fact that Plato in other places refers to Orphic doctrine by the phrase "old tradition". In the *Phaedo*,‡ for instance, he so refers to the transmigration of souls, which was certainly a tenet of the Orphics, and, in his seventh Epistle,§ to the Orphic doctrines of immortality and the judgment of the soul after death. Thus the scholiast is amply justified, on the most general grounds, apart from his specific quotation, in attributing the allusion in the *Laws* to one of those "Orphic hymns" which Plato in the same treatise mentions by name.

\* Kern, *Orphicorum fragmenta*, 245.

† 270 C.

† iv, 715 D.

§ vii, 33. 5



The scholiast's quotation is :

God is the beginning, God is the middle, and from God all things have been fashioned. God is the foundation of the earth and the starry heaven.

The first time this couplet is quoted as Orphic is by a commentator on the exordium of the *Phainomena* of Aratus, one of the passages of the "Greek poets" referred to by St. Paul in the Acts,\* and Plutarch in his tract, *On the Failure of the Oracles*,† in quoting the same line with a minor verbal variation, attributes it to "the very ancient theologians", which is a familiar way of referring to the Orphic corpus. It is upon this "old tradition" of Plato's *Laws*, evidently Orphic as it is, that we base our belief that Orpheus was, as we have said, no mere historical character but a maker of history, and a prophet of truth in that he first taught the Greek world that God is One.

The doctrine of the immanence of One God expressed in this tradition is, to put the matter at its lowest, the expression of a great mind, and this is true whether the scholiast's identification of the actual lines is correct or not. Here is a doctrine which it takes genius to achieve—for the "natural man" is animistic or polytheistic and by himself will continue to be so—here is a doctrine which it takes genius to achieve, taught in early times by the Orphic religion. All antiquity bears witness to the fact that the Orphic religion was due to one great man, Orpheus. Why refuse to assign a doctrine which is a mark of genius to the one man of whose greatness in this connexion we have evidence? Had all the rest of our literary records been consumed by the "vandal mice" and the Caliph Omar, the passage in the *Laws* would still be a rock of assurance, proof against all dynamiting of religious genius in Greece in an age which was antiquity to Plato. There is no Lazarus who will rise from the dead to assure us that the plays of Shakespeare were written in very truth by William Shakespeare of Stratford and by no Bacon or de Vere. There is none

\* xviii, 28.

† 48, p. 436d.

who can pledge us that Orpheus and none other was the great man to whom the meteor moment of this ancient revelation came. But what would you? The evidence is plain, and they who will not believe would not believe though one rose from the dead.

As down the night the splendour voyages  
From some long-ruined and night-submerged star,

so, for those who see, shines down the ages the light of the long-obsured genius of Orpheus, the prophet of God to the Greeks.

He, like Moses, met God upon the mountains. In all the ancient accounts he is a Thracian. Polygnotus, in giving him ordinary Greek dress, without the typical Thracian cap and skin, in the painting of the underworld described by Pausanias,\* was merely acting as did Fra Lippo Lippi in painting his Madonnas in kirtle of the Quattrocento. Euripides,† for instance, tells how on the peaks of Olympus:

Orpheus lute-playing  
Mustered the trees with his music  
Mustered the beasts of the wild;

and all the other ancient authorities place the habitat of Orpheus between Olympus and Pangaeus (now Bunar Dag) which looks over the plains of the ancient Philippi towards Thasos. Now it was not without some justification that late grammarians derived the Greek word for pious ritualism, "*threskeia*", from the word "Thraix", "Thracian", which it resembles: unsound may be the etymology, but sound was the instinct. There is no gain-saying the lexicographer‡ of the Dark Ages who says that "these [the Thracians] first developed the religious consciousness among the Greeks". In Thrace, Orpheus grew up among the Dionysiac worship known, though not understood, by Homer, who refers to the opposition by King Lycurgus to the rites at their beginning, speak-

\* X, 306.

† *Bacchæ*, 560 (Murray's translation).

‡ *Etymologicum magnum*, 455, 10.

§ II., vi, 132.

ing of the "Maenads" as nurses of Dionysus. Homer's misunderstanding of what was then a new religion is comparable in the pagan world to Suetonius' misunderstanding of the beginnings of Christianity, crystallized in the familiar sentence that there were riots at Rome "Chresto impulsore".

The ecstatic worship of Dionysus on the mountains is described by Euripides in the *Bacchae*, in words which are largely quoted in the play of the Christian era, *Christus Patiens*, formerly attributed to St. Gregory of Nazianzus, one of the four great Fathers of the Eastern Church. Euripides, of course, though the scene of his play is set at Thebes, was writing at the court of King Archelaus in Western Thrace of what doubtless he had seen in those parts, at the festivals of Dionysus, when the Maenads ran wild through the mountains, clad in fawn-skins and girdled with snakes, and ate raw flesh and suckled the young of wild beasts. The worshippers aimed at becoming one with Dionysus, who may well have been the god of "whirling" (*dinos*) before he was the god of wine. Orpheus is said,\* I believe with truth, to have been a "leader in the rites of Dionysus". He was a great man, and would doubtless be a leader.

The vast mass of the votaries never passed, in all probability, beyond the primitive frenzy, but to the soul of this man, concentrated in its fervour, came a "revelation", dim and distant doubtless, but none the less a "revelation". Olympus, or Pangaeus, was his Damascus road; among the thrilled Thracian highlands, as the passion of the Maenads surged yeastily, the sea of exalted emotion overwhelmed him, overflowed all breakwaters in his soul. United in ecstasy with the primitive god Dionysus, he passed beyond and above that stage of religion: his great soul, taut in its straining towards the highest, found itself in the grip of a power so strong that he could not but believe it to be the one Supreme Power of the world. To him came the true mystical experience, wherein, in white light ineffable, dawns divinity on the soul, which feels that it has travelled beyond the heaven of heavens, beyond all being,

\* Proclus in *Rempublicam* I, 1, 174, 21 (Kroll's edition.)

into the presence of Eternal Glory, so that it is bathed in an apocalyptic sea of bliss and there is peace as on the morning of Eternity. In such an experience Orpheus passed, as the Christian Fathers said he did, from polytheism to the realization of the Oneness of God.

If anyone thinks that this picture is merely imaginative, and asks again for evidence, the primary evidence once more is in the *Laws* of Plato. That Orpheus reached by ecstasy the monotheism which is there by implication attributed to him is a legitimate inference from the nature of the case (for I hold that it is only by direct "revelation" that man comes to belief in the Oneness of God), from the circumstances of Orpheus, living in a Maenad-haunted land and said on overwhelming authority to have been associated with Dionysiac worship, and from the fact that Orphism, which he founded, was a truly mystical religion. And here it occurs to me to adduce, not as primary but as confirmatory evidence, the asceticism of Orpheus. Orphism was undoubtedly an ascetic cult: that it inculcated vegetarianism we know from Aristophanes,\* and it is extremely likely that the stories of the enmity of the Thracian women to Orpheus point to sexual asceticism on his part. I have little doubt that he did practise the asceticism which has always been recognized as one of the necessary preliminaries to ecstasy. That Orphism was a truly mystical religion is shown by the well-known gold plaques found in Southern Italy, at Compagno, Petelia, and elsewhere; if they were not, as they are, sufficient evidence of the nature of the cult, the familiar saying of the sect, "We behold a bright light, but with our eyes we see nothing", would be conclusive; it can refer to nothing else but mystical experience. These sectaries were striving, to the best of their ability, after a "revelation" of the kind which had come to their founder, Orpheus. And it is relevant to remember that not only were they striving in this way after the light, which we have every ground for assuming that they embraced when the Gospel was preached to them, but in other

\* *Frogs*, 1032.

ways, e.g. in their doctrine of heaven and hell, they anticipated Christian dogma to some extent.

Many of the tales told by ancient writers about Orpheus cannot be other than legends, of course, but it is quite reasonable to hold that the tales of his music, how he

with his lute made trees  
And the mountain-tops that freeze  
Bow themselves when he did sing,

do in fact show that he was a musical genius as well as a religious one. I have heard it argued that since in the first passage in Greek literature where he is given a definite function he is regarded as a musician (this being in the fourth Pythian ode of Pindar), and since what is commonly said of his music has a legendary air, we must conclude that he was simply a legendary musician. The vast bulk of the ancient evidence, however, lays stress on his religious function, and it is notable that when details of his song are given, not only by the Orphic *Argonautica*, which naturally has a cosmological bias, but also by Apollonius Rhodius,\* his theme is how the heavens came to be stretched out like a curtain, how the world began, and the stories of old religion: there is in fact no more reason why he should not have been prominent in the spheres both of religion and music—as Strabo says the olden prophets were—than, for instance, Terpander. The latter is best known as a musician: he is said not only by Plutarch, but also by the fifth-century dithyrambic poet Timotheus,† to have been a follower of Orpheus in music: but the chief quotation‡ we have from his written work is a famous spondaic couplet of which the first line sounds almost like an echo of Plato's "old tradition":

God the beginning of all things, the leader of all things, God, to thee I dedicate this beginning of my hymns.

Modern commentators on Terpander, being, as it seems to me, unreasonably biased on the question, object

\* i, 494 ff.

† *Persa*, 234 ff.

‡ Fr. 2.

to taking the first line in its obvious cosmogonic sense, holding such doctrine to be later; but have they had nine lives like Pythagoras? They have forgotten Plato's, as well as other, evidence. Their attempt to make the first line as well as the second refer to songs only is unconvincing, and it is by no means incredible that Terpander, while imitating, as Plutarch says he did, the music of Orpheus, may have learnt and imitated also his doctrine.

With a view to making our picture more lifelike it is worth while to glance at the account of Orpheus given by Strabo,\* in the first century B.C.:

Orpheus was of the tribe of the Cicones (a Thracian tribe), and was a man of magical power both as regards music and divination. He went about practising orgiastic rites, and later, waxing self-confident, he obtained many followers and great influence. Some accepted him willingly; others, suspecting that he meditated violence and conspiracy, attacked and slew him.

This reads soberly enough, and fits in quite well with the similarly sober and, as I believe, essentially true statement of Diodorus,† that Orpheus "changed many things in the orgiastic ceremonies, wherefore men also called the rites originated by Dionysus Orphic."

If we notice the latter statement first, all the evidence—from that of Euripides,‡ the author of the *Rhesus*§ (if that was not Euripides) and Aristophanes|| downwards—is that Orpheus was a prophet who founded a sect and a doctrine, but not a frenzy: he found a frenzy and left a religion. We have shown wherein lay his essential and revolutionary originality. Miss Harrison¶ is doubtless right in saying, partly on the evidence of the *Iobaccheion* of Hadrian's time, and partly from general considerations, that Orpheus "introduced the element of quiet and order into the ancient revels", and certainly he was a missionary of mysticism, "lending to an ancient superstition a new spiritual significance, and teaching a doctrine which gave to its votaries a missionary fire and

\* vii, fr. 17.

|| loc. cit.

† iii, 6.

‡ Hippolytus, 952.

§ 943.

¶ *Prolegomena to Study of Greek Religion*.



an immortal hope. That the religion as purified by him was capable, like all religions, of degradation by the baser sort, is doubtless true, and Plato's jeers\* at the promises of "an everlasting carouse" made by the mendicant Orphic priests are well known, but it is plain that Orphism did have a spiritualizing influence.

As to Strabo's account of the life of Orpheus, has it not the air of verisimilitude? By accepting it we do not commit ourselves to the principle that it is reasonable to believe anything in an ancient author which does not contain inherent absurdities. But when we have on other grounds accepted the historicity of Orpheus, we find that in the nature of the case Strabo's account of his life is very probable. It is likely that, believing himself to have received a revelation, he should wax self-confident, and that his bearing, as well as the revolutionary nature of his ideas, should arouse opposition, leading to his death. The same point is put in different ways in different accounts of his death by different authors. Conon† says that the Thracian women slew him because he did not share his rites with them: doubtless he made his cult esoteric and not public, as was the Thracian worship of Dionysus. Another author‡ says that Dionysus sent the Bassarids to slay him because he deserted the Dionysiac worship in favour of that of the Sun, thinking the Sun the greatest of the gods, and habitually awaiting the dawn on Mount Pangaeus. Here it occurs to me to suggest that when Sun-worship is attributed to Orpheus it may well be a way of speaking of his mystical experience, for in ecstasy a great light is seen as of the "sun at midnight", to use the familiar phrase employed by Apuleius§ in describing a mystic initiation, and the sun has often therefore been used as a symbol of the human experience, as, for instance, I suggest, by Ikhnaton, the heretic king of Egypt and by Plato,|| as well as by Plotinus (*passim*). Besides the legend of his death immortalized by Milton, and the sober statement of Strabo, Orpheus is also said to

\* *Republic*, 363 D.

† *Pseudo-Eratosthenes*, 24, p. 140 Rob.

|| *Republic*, vii, ad init.

‡ f. 45.

§ *Metamorphoses*, xi, 23.

have been struck by lightning (St. Paul, it will be remembered, was, as it were, struck by lightning upon the Damascus road). Pausanias\* mentioned the reason given for this :

Because of the teaching which he gave in the mysteries to men who had not heard it before.

All these accounts, though differing in detail, agree in the general picture they give of Orpheus, and there is every reason to believe on general grounds that it is a true picture. He very likely came to a violent end because of the opposition his confidence in his religious revolution aroused in a wild country : or if he did not—and we cannot be dogmatic—his behaviour was such that men felt that he ought to have done : for that is the fate of prophets. Were not the Jewish hierarchy who delivered Our Lord to death at Roman hands provoked by what they regarded as His overweening self-confidence and sacrilegious doctrine ? It would appear to be very likely that, as we have already hinted, the men of the early Church had got hold of more truth than, in all probability, they fully realized, when they made Orpheus a symbol of Our Lord on the Berlin signet-ring and on the walls of the catacombs.

Before leaving the personality of Orpheus, one further evidence that he was an historical character may be mentioned, and that is his fame as a prophet outside the boundaries of the Orphic religion.

The Aeginetans [says Pausanias†] honour Hecate, saying that Orpheus established this rite for them.

Again : ‡

The Lacedaemonians have a temple of Korè Soteira, and they say that Orpheus the Thracian made it.

In the following chapter§ we read that the “Lacedaemonians say that they worship Demeter of the under-

\* ix, 305.

† ii, 14.

‡ Paus., iii, 13.

§ *ibid.*, iii, 14.

world, by the institution of Orpheus". The fame which caused these ascriptions was not due to the forgery of documents in Athens or Southern Italy (which sceptics are inclined to point as the origin of the Orphic corpus), even though such forgery may have taken place. The Orphic religion itself was always unofficial and its individual votaries are practically all unknown. It was not the fame of the sect which made the Aeginetans and the Spartans anxious to connect their rites with Orpheus. It was his universal fame as a religious teacher : and what was the fountain of that fame but truth ?

That he was always best known as a prophet is emphasized by the fact that what is probably the oldest-known form of his name, Orphas, is to be found on the building which seems to be the treasury of the Sicyonians at Delphi; this building has not been beyond doubt identified, but it is of the sixth century B.C.

In the middle of the sixth century also the Italian poet, Ibycus,\* according to the grammarians, referred to "famous Orpheus"—spelling the name "Orphên" in the accusative case—and was therefore the first author to mention the great prophet.

Further, the fact that in Pisistratean Athens, in the sixth century B.C., Onomacritus is said to have written Orphic hymns is evidence that Orphism was flourishing in his time. He would not have taken the trouble to write poems and attribute them to Orpheus if there had not been a ready public for such poems. Although Pausanias says that Onomacritus invented rites in honour of Dionysus, it is very unlikely from what we otherwise hear of him, as the redactor of Homer, and the man who was banished from Athens for forging oracles of Musaeus, that he was a fervent religious leader : and the fact of his activity is a further aid in dating the founder of the cult whose literature he elaborated. Herodotus is doubtless right in saying that the poets sometimes supposed to be anterior to Homer and Hesiod—i.e., though he does not name them, Orpheus and Musaeus—were later ; and his date for Homer, 850 B.C., is doubtless only true of the earliest parts of the poems, if any : but at least a hundred

\* fr. 10a (Bergk).

years are needed to allow for the growth of the fame of Orpheus and of Orphism up to the middle of the sixth century, so that the date of the death of Orpheus can scarcely be later than 650 B.C., and the same date is made necessary by the reference in the *Laws*, if we are to allow adequate time for the tradition to have become ancient in Plato's day. Probably the *floruit* of Orpheus should be placed about 700 B.C. It may be remarked in passing that in the fifth century Euripides the rationalist, who makes Hippolytus an Orphic, and refers to the masses of Orphic literature extant in his own day, has no doubt about the antiquity of the faith; there is nothing to show that the date of the founder may not be before the lower limits, and Eusebius,\* who says that it was in the year 749 B.C. that "Orpheus the Thracian became known", may quite well have hit upon a true date.

In any case, whether the arguments here put forward carry conviction on first acquaintance or not, I feel that there is matter worthy of the attention of all those interested in the history of religious experience in what ancient writers tell us of Orpheus, the prophet—according to Church Fathers of high authority—of the Oneness of God to Greece.

C. R. KING.

\* *Chron. anno 749.*

## ART. 6.—NOTES ON FRENCH POETRY SINCE THE WAR

Whatever does not express in the language of the generality truths that interest or concern the generality, as well as whatever is not clear, is not French ; and it will be remarked that it is for this reason that the majority of our Romanticists and still more of our Dilettantes are ignored by foreigners. . . . On the other hand, the socialization of literature, if I may venture on this expressive barbarism, has allowed us in the past not only, as has been seen, to resist foreign influence, and to assimilate merely such foreign elements as could be made to serve the turn of our genius, but to exercise in the world the intellectual supremacy we have wielded more often than any other people.

**S**O wrote Ferdinand Brunetière many years before the Great War. If it be no longer truth that the French Romanticists are mostly ignored by foreigners, it is a fact that the poetry of the French, as partaking somewhat of the character of Dilettantism, is the least-known side of their literature in foreign countries. The poetry of France is—more so now than ever—essentially personal ; it acknowledges no schools ; each singer insists upon his personal freedom and strongly marks his individuality. If the effects of the great upheaval, still so strongly felt in other spheres of human activity, are noticeable, as they needs must be, in poetry as in other branches of literature, they are not more marked in France than in other countries, whereas one might have expected the reverse. They are perhaps less pronounced in this than in some other forms of art.

Somewhat similar reactions were noticed during and immediately after the war in French as in English poetry : on the one hand, a desire to get away from the conflict, to dwell on serener and pleasanter thoughts and ideals ; on the other, the torment, human, religious, and philosophical, engendered by the war and accompanied by hatred and revolt—natural hatred, a heritage of the past ; revolt against the conditions of the present.

When the history of contemporary literature comes to be written, say in a hundred or so years' time, it will be found that the world war left but slight scars upon

true literature—such as will have survived—and this is as it should be. Such external cataclysms, grievous as they are in their epoch, can have and do have but little weight beside the sempiternal themes that occupy the human mind and heart. Poetry indeed would not be what it is were this otherwise. Factors more subtle have exercised a certain though slow influence on the modern evolution of poetry, showing that, if the pen is mightier than the sword, so too is tradition stronger than the voice of the cannon.

Do we find then that French poetry has during the past ten or fifteen years shown and maintained a high level of inspiration? Has it wrenched itself, as it were, from the trough of suffering to keep on a plane of lofty thought and emotion?

No, with some few exceptions, this cannot be said to have been the case. There have been highly intellectual phases; there have been streams of noble passion, but they have been rare. The big chorus of poets and minor poets have kept pretty much to the same very personal, sensuous, and intimate subjects that have for generations been their general currency. And the difference between the categories of poets is in France less marked than in some literatures. With us English, whose prose is often so slipshod, the mere fact of expressing thought in measure and rhythm tends to give more dignity, if not indeed austerity, to such thoughts (putting aside *vers de société* or humorous verse). With the French this is much less so—since the days of the great classics; and cleverness of versification and sprightliness of metaphor seem to carry with them a certain facility to mental gymnastics, preciosity, and Puckishness. Art soon becomes artifice. The French cannot help showing us the machinery, nor taking us into the wings back of stage. For once that we witness Truth standing gloriously erect as she issues from the well, one may see her half a dozen times as she comes from her bath or dressing for the part. The heroic palls and fades into the commonplace or the merely trivial. As the critic Pierre Lasserre put it: "This marriage of Homer with the Chat Noir . . ."



## 74 Notes on French Poetry Since the War

Just as to the painter the model is often more important than the idea, so to the poet the way he gets his effects counts often more than the effect, and even submerges it.

The influence of Edmond Rostand is still very real in its most meretricious forms—what a critic calls the “picturesque and even caricatural deformation of reality by a certain imagery”. More than that, it often amounts to attaining a rhyme or a jingle to show cleverness at the expense of sense. Take a couplet like, for instance,

Elle relevait ses paupières  
Ainsi qu'on relève ses jupes,

(She raised her eyelashes as one raises one's skirt),

which is more Montmartrois than poetical. Less so, though Rostandesque, is the couplet :

Est-ce que le bonheur, ce soir même, poète,  
Est dans ton âme ainsi que la lune sur l'eau ?

(Has happiness, this evening, poet, come into your soul like the moon on the water ?)

In lines like,

Je me souviens d'un temps où les jeunes colombes  
Qui se posaient au toit courbe de ma maison  
Semblaient s'y plaire autant qu'aux alentours des tombes,

(I recall a time when the young doves which alighted on the rounded roof of my house seemed to be as pleased there as in the vicinity of the tombs,)

from Charles Derennes, one is shocked by the feeling that the third line is only brought in because “tombes” rhymes with “colombes”, since no one but poets has ever known doves to show a predilection for flying round tombs ! The following picture of *ennui*, from Tristan Derême, comes into another category, but it “derives” more from the Chat Noir than from Homer :

Je soupire ; je m'ennuie  
Comme un âne sous la pluie  
Quand personne ne l'essuie.  
Le vent souffle comme il veut  
Tandis qu'une cloche sonne ;  
Il pleut, et je n'ai personne  
A qui dire—Comme il pleut !

(I sigh ; I am bored, like an ass in the rain when nobody wipes it. The wind blows as it lists, while a bell is ringing. It is raining and I have no one to whom I can say : "How it is raining !")

It would be cruel to seek for logic in this bit of artificial whimsicality, but we are to gather from it that a donkey (perhaps like a human being) is less miserable in the rain when he is wiped than if left without any such sympathetic touch. The sounding bell certainly adds a touch of *ennui* to the picture, but the last two lines, if they were not French, would come very near to bathos. The same author continues with a strange clash of the ancient and modern (like some of our recent British poets) :

Nous avons aussi nos barbares,  
Et nos barbares sont auteurs :  
Ils s'enivrent aux bruits des gares  
Et des moteurs ;  
Ils goûtent d'étranges délices  
Dans le tourbillon des hélices ;  
Et préparent pour les Neuf Sœurs  
Des ascenseurs.

(We also have our barbarians, and our barbarians are authors ; they intoxicate themselves with the noises of stations and motors ; they enjoy strange delights in the uproar of propellers ; and prepare for the Nine Sisters—lifts)

A mere piece of preciousness like :

Il est plaisant de regarder la Seine  
Se caresser aux hanches de ses berges,\*

only makes one smile, though that is not the intention ; the metaphor, it is true, is striking, and would not seem

\* Roger Allard, *Poèmes légères*.

## 76 Notes on French Poetry Since the War

so absurd if said in the less rapid and abrupt manner that is suited to prose.

An outstanding recent event has been the death of Anna Comtesse de Noailles, justly celebrated by her contemporaries, though by birth a foreigner, as the greatest French poet of her epoch. In her indeed was great and sustained inspiration and a noble mind, masculine in its force and range, intensely feminine in its delicacy of expression as also in its subjectivity; and yet, must it be confessed? monotonous in its unrelieved gloom, its negation and despair, and continual insistence upon the *tristesse de vivre*. She might have said, as our own Shelley is reported to have declared, that one might as well "ask for gin at a butcher's shop" as expect humour—or even lightness—from her. And yet Shelley did have his gayer moments when he was not brooding on this "vale of tears", and always he was conscious of its beauty. Readers of Anna de Noailles' earlier work will have been impressed by her persistent dwelling on the subject of death:

Vienne à présent la mort et son atroce calme,  
Mer où les vaisseaux n'ont ni voiles ni hauban,  
Contrée où nul zéphyr ne fait bouger les palmes,  
Arène où nul couteau ne trouve un cœur sanglant !

Vienne la mort, mon âme a dépassé les bornes ;  
Mon esprit, comme un astre, aux cieux s'est projeté,  
J'ignorerai l'abîme humiliant et morne,  
Mon cœur dans la douleur eut son éternité ;\*

(Come now death and its horrible calm—Sea where the vessels have neither sails nor rudder, Country where no zephyr shakes the palms, Arena where no knife finds a bleeding heart. Come, death, my soul has passed the limits; My mind, like a star, has flown to the skies; I shall ignore the sad and humiliating abyss. My heart had its eternity in suffering)

And again :

Et parmi cette affreuse et poignardente injure  
Seulement toi, visage au masque de velours,  
Divinité maligne, enivrante, âpre et pure,  
Consolateur cruel, doux et terrible Amour !

\* "Les Morts", from *Les Vivants et les Morts*.

## Notes on French Poetry Since the War 77

(And amid this fearful and stabbing insult, Only thou, face with the mask of velvet, Pernicious divinity, thrilling, rough and pure, Cruel consoler, soft and yet terrible love !)

This gloomy tendency is if anything increased in her later work, in which the subject of Love—a very lugubrious love, which never carries any aspect of joy—and Death predominate, and her love is marked with death. The later "Poème de l'Amour" is impregnated with bitterness and despair :

Oui, la douceur est toujours feinte  
En amour—Croirais-tu vraiment  
Que ce brûlant contentement  
Ne masquât pas d'amères plaintes ?

(Yes, gentleness is always feigned in love—Wouldst thou really believe that this burning contentment would not mask bitter complaints ?)

I have accepted nothing [she says again, in one of her recent books] from my stay on earth. Never has human destiny had my consent. . . . A solitary nomad, I fled from the paradise of joy to the hells of torment. . . . I enjoy the serenity of being without hope. I wish for nothing. I have taken farewell of myself ; my strength, my desires, my regrets and suffering, have ended as time lets the months fall away. . . .

And so on, through pages—deception, disillusion, despair.

She analyses her sombre love from all the angles of her dejection, "folly", and abasement. "Love is neither joyful nor tender," she exclaims in "L'Ombre des Jours". Again : "For it is natural for the soul to live alone and enjoy its loneliness."

Yet in this gloomy passion, and in spite of negation and despair, there is a concentrated mysticism which rises above mere mortal love, certainly above the carnal ; and here we find the great depth and vision of the poet. Her analysis of her emotions ("My heart, it is only you I fear"), of her aspect of and "reaction" to Nature, are instinct with an almost religious passion, often despairing, sometimes even morbid, but alive with a subtle and

## 78 Notes on French Poetry Since the War

haunting beauty. We find the key to some of this in her references to her own semi-Oriental origin and her "nostalgia" for the East (in the beautiful lines on Constantinople, for instance):

Peut-être que ma longue et profonde tristesse  
Qui va priant, criant,  
N'est que ce dur besoin qui m'afflige et m'opprime  
De vivre en Orient !

(Perhaps my long, deep sadness, which is continually praying and crying, Is only the great need that afflicts and oppresses me To live in the East !)

It is strange for students of French literature to think that three of the great poets of the century—Paul Claudel, Francis Jammes, and Peguy—were all converts to Catholicism fairly early in life and obtained much of their inspiration from that fact, whereas this remarkable woman remains persistently without faith, without hope, despairing and rebellious. The theme is reiterated all through her work:

Ils ont inventé l'âme afin que l'on abaisse  
Le corps, unique lieu de rêve et de raison,  
Asile du désir, de l'image et des sons,  
Et par qui tout est mort dès le moment qu'il cesse.

J'affirme, en recherchant vos nuits vastes et vaines,  
Qu'il n'est rien qui survive à la chaleur des veines.

Rien ; l'univers n'est rien. Nulle énigme pour l'homme  
Dont l'esprit et le sens ont perçu le néant.

Rien. Partout l'éphémère et partout le risible,  
Partout l'insulte au cœur, partout la surdité,  
J'examine ce soir ma vie âpre et compacte :  
J'ai fait ce que j'ai pu, d'un haut et triste cœur,  
Sachant que mes peines et beaucoup de mes actes  
Ont sombré à jamais, sans bruit et sans lueur.

(They invented the soul in order to abase the body, sole region of dreaming and of reason, Home of hope, of imagery and of sounds, And through which all is dead the moment it ceases.

## Notes on French Poetry Since the War 79

I affirm, in looking back over your vast and vain nights, that there is nothing that survives the heat of the veins.

Nothing; the universe is nothing. No enigma for man, Whose mind and sense have pierced its nullity.

Nothing. Everywhere the ephemeral and everywhere the laughable, Everywhere the insult to the heart, and deafness. I examine this evening my life, rough but compact. I have done what I could, with a heart uplifted and sad, Knowing that my sorrows and many of my acts Have perished for ever, noiseless and without casting any light.)

A totally different inspiration is that of the "Gothic" Paul Claudel, dramatist and lyric poet, whose output, enormous and complex, has been discussed minutely and at length by two schools of criticism. "Never, not even with Victor Hugo," says the spokesman of one of these schools, "has one seen the branches of the poetical vine weighed down with such huge bunches of images." "There are times when one is astonished to find oneself his contemporary," declares Henry Clouard, who speaks of his heroic and Aeschylean tone. "His verses follow a new and mysterious law of his own invention"; and this is certainly true. On the other hand, there are critics, and not the least, who look upon Claudel's work as a mass of extravagance and absurdity.

The chief cause of this hasty judgment is the complexity and obscurity of his language. Other great writers, one critic has said, completed their harvesting themselves and "did not leave us to turn the mill—did not nourish the public with roots, but with fruit". Pierre Lasserre speaks of a "tumultuous and vain quest for inspiration".

That is one opinion. To balance it an admirer says Claudel came at the right time to enlarge a stunted literature. He was the first of poets of high standing to get out of the anti-clerical and anti-religious groove that had held French literature since the Renaissance. He himself defines poetry as "a natural flow of grace and freshness". "Language," he says, "has two objects—to produce in the mind a state of knowledge and a condition of joy."

Claudel's dominant theme is the Christian mystery



## 80 Notes on French Poetry Since the War

("There is not a phrase of his from which the Cross is absent"). He has spoken of his revolt from the "horrors" of the Naturalist and irreligious literature of the "eighteen-eighties", and has acknowledged his indebtedness to that erratic genius, Arthur Rimbaud. The philosopher Bergson also exercised a certain influence over the working of his mind. To Claudel the world is above all things a "spirituality":

O Dieu, j'entends mon âme folle en moi qui pleure et qui chante.

(O God! I hear my foolish soul in me weeping and singing.)

From the "Mystères de la Nuit de Noël" to "L'Annonce faite à Marie", his arrow-like thought, as it has been described, is a river of intellectual lyricism flowing through religious channels. One of his remarkable Odes takes the form of a kind of dialogue between the Soul and the Guardian Angel; others are dialogues with God or the Muse. On the birth of a son Claudel writes:

Soyez béni parce que je ne demeure point unique  
Et que de moi il est sorti existence et suscitation de mon  
immortel enfant, et que de moi à mon tour en cette  
image réelle pour jamais d'une âme jointe avec un corps  
Vous avez reçu figure et dimension.

(Be blessed because I do not remain unique And because from me has come existence and the calling to life of my immortal child, and that from me in my turn in this image real for ever of a soul joined to a body You have received shape and dimension.)

He writes again:

O mon âme sauvage, il faut nous tenir libre et prêts  
Comme les immenses bandes fragiles d'hirondelles  
Quand sans voix retentit l'appel automnal!  
O mon âme impatiente, pareille à l'aigle sans art! . . .  
Que mon vers ne soit rien d'esclave! mais tel  
Que l'aigle marin qui s'est jeté sur un grand poisson,  
Et l'on ne voit rien qu'un éclatant tourbillon d'ailes et  
l'éclaboussement de l'écume!  
Mais vous ne m'abandonnez point, O Muses modératrices!

(Oh! my wild soul, we must keep ourselves free and ready  
Like the enormous fragile bands of swallows When the voiceless  
autumnal appeal sounds! O my impatient soul, similar to  
the artless eagle! Let my verses have nothing slavish about them,  
but (be) like the marine eagle which has thrown itself on to a  
great fish, and one sees nothing but a vivid whirl of wings and  
the splashing of the foam. . . . But you will not abandon me,  
moderating Muses!)

Nothing "slavish" about this, certainly!

Another great poet against whom the charge of obscurity is made, not without reason, is Paul Valéry (the critic Thibaudet calls his "Jeune Parque" the most obscure poem in the language). But again in Valéry's case the trouble to unravel his thought is justified by the result. (One cannot always say this, and the vice, or quality, of being obscure has grown considerably with French poetry.) Valéry, who, like Paul Claudel, is, besides being a *littérateur*, also a member of the diplomatic corps, and whose fame is of comparatively recent growth, was elected to the French Academy in November 1925, in succession to Anatole France. In this case the Academy did honour to itself.

Valéry is known as the most subtly intellectual of all French poets and as the most poetical of her thinkers. He acknowledges Mallarmé, who had great influence over him, as *maître*; and among the poets of the past whom he admires is E. A. Poe. Students have commented on his passion for architecture and music, of the qualities of both of which he considers poetry should partake. Pierre Louys, a very different type of writer, was among the first to encourage him to write.

With regard to that charge of obscurity, has not Valéry himself written: "There is nothing more morbid in itself, or more inimical to Nature, than to see things as they are"; and on another occasion he announces: "I love thought as others love nudity."\* He refers scornfully to J.-J. Rousseau's "passion" for Nature as the mere desire of a man to "make an excursion into the country"!

\* Because this is cryptic, I give the French phrase: "J'aime la pensée comme les autres aiment le nu."

## 82 Notes on French Poetry Since the War

Cieux, son erreur ! Temps, sa ruine !

speaking of the Deity, is one of Valéry's lines which linger in the memory ; and a fine example of his lyric fervour are the following lines in "Ebauche d'un Serpent".

Soleil ! Soleil ! . . . Faute éclatante !  
Toi qui masque la mort, Soleil !  
Sous l'azur et l'or d'une tente  
Où les fleurs tiennent leur conseil.

Tu gardes les cœurs de connaître  
Que l'univers n'est qu'un défaut  
Dans le pureté du Non-Etre.

Toujours la mensonge m'a plu  
Que tu répands sur l'absolu,  
O Roi des ombres fait de flammes !

(Sun ! Sun ! Striking fault ! Thou that maskest death, O Sun ! under the azure and gold of a tent where the flowers keep counsel.

Thou keepest hearts from knowing that the universe is only an error in the purity of the Non-Being.

The untruth has always pleased me that thou spreadest over the absolute, O King of shadows made of flame !)

Among the leading poets who have been directly inspired by the war, besides Claudel,\* are François Porché, Fernand Gregh, and that curious poet of the *Ballades Françaises*, in twenty volumes, Paul Fort, known as the "Prince of Poets".

Porché's poems on the war—*Les Commandements du Destin* (with sections headed : "The Stop on the Marne" ; "The Poem of the Trench" ; "War Images" ; "Villages at the Rear")—have a fine virile style and are very modern in their realism :

L'herbe veut qu'on la nettoie.  
Va, l'homme en bleu, cherche, fouille.

\* Viens avec nous, peuple casqué : Come with us, people with the helmet : Here is the unfordable river of Justice ; here the arms of innocents inextricably round you like brambles ! Feel the earth under your feet full of the dead, it is soft and gives way. (From *Poèmes de Guerre*).

## Notes on French Poetry Since the War 83

Les fosses sont pleins de morts ;  
Va toujours, piétine, enjambe ;  
Le ruisseau rougit ses bords,  
La nuit tombe et le ciel flambe.

Combien de tonnes de fer,  
Combien de barils de poudre,  
Dépensés par heure à moudre,  
A martyriser la chair.

(The grass wants to be cleaned. Go, man in blue, seek, hunt round.

The ditches are full of dead. Go on still, stamp about, stretch your legs. The banks of the brook are blushing ; night falls and the sky is flaming.

How many tons of iron, how many barrels of powder, wasted per hour to grind and martyrize the flesh.)

Fernand Gregh's refined Muse, full of meditation and mystical tenderness, brings a more optimistic note than the Comtesse de Noailles. His first published volume, *La Maison de l'Enfance*, dates from 1896, and he has written two volumes directly inspired by the war : *La Couronne Douloureuse*, and *Couleur de la Vie*. But I prefer his other work, which is instinct with a tender brooding on natural phenomena :

J'aime jusqu'à ces maux dont je voudrais guérir,  
Jusqu'à l'idée, hélas ! que j'en pourrai mourir,  
Jusqu'au splendide effroi que donne le tombeau,—  
Et que bon ou mauvais, n'importe, vivre est beau.

(I love even to these ills from which I wish to be cured, Even to the idea, alas ! that I might die of them, Even to the splendid fright given by the tomb,—And that good or bad, no matter, it is fine to live.)

And this :

C'est l'arbre. Il est opaque, immobile et vivant,  
Il bouge dans le ciel, il trempe dans le vent.  
Une nuit verte inonde en plein jour ses ramures,  
La moindre brise en tire un millier de murmures,

## 84 Notes on French Poetry Since the War

Et toujours quelque oiseau qui plonge dans l'air bleu ;  
Puis, quand le crépuscule épaissit peu à peu,  
Tel qu'une eau sous-marine et glauque, le silence,  
Lentement il le boit comme une éponge immense.

(This is the tree. It is opaque, motionless and yet living, It moves in the sky and dips into the wind. A green night floods its branches into full daylight. The slightest breeze draws from it a thousand murmurs, And always some bird, which plunges into the blue air ; Then, when the twilight gradually thickens, like water submarine and thick, the silence, Slowly it drinks it in like an enormous sponge.)

The *Ballades Françaises* of the highly original Paul Fort are written in a curious form which has been described as "*vers polymorphes*", and, by Pierre Louys, as "familiar alexandrines". Unconventional as he is, Paul Fort has aroused the enthusiasm of most of his contemporaries for a spontaneous ebullition of thought mixed with erudition and tempered with the ideas of what in France is called the "*populo*". His *Bulletin Lyrique de la Guerre* contains sections entitled : "Cathédrale de Reims" ; "La Marseillaise" ; "Le Chant des Anglais" ; "Ce Que Nous Défendons". A specimen of his work is the following from "Rheims Cathedral" :—

Monstrueux général Baron von Plattenberg,\* si je vous dois ce chant d'amour à mon église, je vous passe en retour, sachant qu'ils éternisent, le soufflet des poètes et l'échafaud du Verbe, mais je tiens magasin de gifles consacrés à tous les Allemands que j'ai pu rencontrer.

Au grand bal de la Mort où Joffre vous convie, qu'ils vont donc bien polker et mazurker, les Boches. Méditez en vos cœurs, soldats, l'instant est proche. Il y va de la France, il y va de sa vie !

(Monstrous General Baron von Plattenberg, if I owe to you this song of love to my church, I pass to you in return, knowing they will become eternal, the whip of the poets and the scaffolding of the Word—but I keep a shop of cuffs consecrated to all the Germans I have been able to meet.

\* Reported to have ordered the bombardment of the cathedral.

## Notes on French Poetry Since the War 85

At the big ball of Death to which Joffre invites you, how well they will polka and dance the mazurka, the Boches! Meditate well in your hearts, soldiers, the moment is close. It's for France now—for her life!)

We have said that obscurity is growing among the poets. Was it for this reason that the late Abbé Bremond in 1926 delivered an address before the Academies on Pure Poetry, in which he asserted that poetry and music are the same thing? The poet, insisted this authority, is only a musician: lively word-painting, sublime thoughts or sentiments, in fact all that comes from the intelligence, should be avoided for poetry to be really "pure".

It was a strange pronouncement for a French Academician.

However that may be, while there are still poets who write on the old sentimental themes, like Philippe Chabanaix ("Couleur du Temps Perdu")—

Cet éventail où passe un vol de colibris  
Et que d'un geste sûr vous déployez, Madame,  
Fait revivre en hiver tous les printemps fleuris  
Et renaître d'Amour et la rose et la flamme

(This fan over which a flock of humming birds passes And which you open with sure touch, Madame, Brings back to life in winter all the flowery springs And revives both the rose and the flame of Love)—

Tristan Derême (*Songes du Poète ; Poèmes des Colombes*); Charles Derennes—there are others of not less note who, tired of the aforesaid sentimental effusions, have struck a stronger, more vivid chord, whose inspiration is fixed on the facts and phenomena with which they are more immediately in contact, and which they describe with a harder grip on realities. Physical and social conditions attract them more than abstract dreams; with poets like Luc Durtain, Pierre Morhamp, André Spire, Charles Vildrac, the outlook on Nature has changed, and especially the poetic vision of love, which is transformed from the old sensuous sentimentality



## 86 Notes on French Poetry Since the War

to regarding the loved one as a companion who aids one to live and shares the troubles and worries of daily life. The poet, in fine, has come down from his garret to mix among ordinary men and realize that like them he has to earn his living and face actual conditions. Turning to another aspect, poetry has like other forms learned geography, and after the "Colonial" poetry of the veteran Jammes—who lives in retirement and has published little of late years—French poets have learned to write with knowledge of other climes, especially the Far East.

Jehan Rictus, the Bohemian chansonnier and reciter of Montmartre, whose poems were all devoted to the misery of the very poor, and whose anathemas against social conditions gave him a place apart, had written little for some years and hardly been heard of. He died, himself in misery, last November.

SOMMERVILLE STORY.

## ART. 7.—KING MANUEL AND PORTUGUESE LITERATURE

**W**HEN a king enters the Republic of Letters he does so at his peril. For, although literature has many and very various mansions, it has or should have no regard for persons, and each writer has to be judged on his merits, irrespective of his rank. The late King Manuel II certainly comes well out of this test. During his exile he had amassed a magnificent Portuguese library, thus satisfying his "passion for old books and old editions" and gathering about him as much of an atmosphere as was now possible for him of his beloved Portugal. Many have had this passion for books without having the gift to communicate any of the interest to others. But King Manuel very markedly had the art to bring his old books to life, "*dar vida aos livros que presentamos*". He had sensitiveness and enthusiasm, the minute accuracy of the scholar, and the scholar's "almost Benedictine patience". He wrote with a pen steeped in the past glories of his country and with a charming modesty, the humility of the truly learned, who know that their knowledge can be but a drop in the ocean of their everlasting ignorance. Enthusiasm sometimes seems to have a blighting influence, but often it draws a willing co-operation from others; and King Manuel acknowledges assistance received from librarians all over the world, from the authorities of the British Museum, from Mr. Benjamin and Mr. Ernest Maggs, from the ever available stores of bibliographical knowledge possessed by Dr. Maurice Ettinghausen, from the King's secretary Miss Margery Withers, and from the eminent historian and critic Professor Edgar Prestage. And truly, the contents of these volumes are such as to provide ample commendation and merit for all concerned in their production. King Manuel was thus well equipped on all sides for undertaking his great task. He had a subject worthy of him, and it received most worthy treatment at his hands. It deserved, and received, all that scholarship and learning, the skill of printer and binder and illustrator, could do for it.

## 88 King Manuel and Portuguese Literature

For the subject was nothing less than the whole early literature and history of Portugal, culminating in the great achievements and discoveries in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The King's love of Portugal gave unity to his subject. Under the guise of a catalogue of old books he embraces all the elements, literary and historical, which led up to the crowning exploits and made them possible. He emphasizes the continuity that lay beneath these exploits: faith in God, confidence in man, and continuity of plan—these were the three conditions or qualities notably present in Portugal's Golden Age and as notoriously absent thereafter. In the name of democracy, equality (envy), liberty, or whatever the catchword may be from time to time, and in the mistaken notion that destruction of a few can beget wealth for the many, all the ancient bases of national prosperity have been and are being cut away, the monarchy, the religious orders, the military orders, religious instruction, the aristocracy, entailed estates, and, lastly, capital. The only possible remedy, but a remedy which will perhaps not be employed, would be to restore the kings to their thrones, the friars to their monasteries, the proprietors to their estates, the merchants to their unfettered initiative, the Army to its legitimate work apart from politics, and, by implication, the peasants to their former prosperity and the world in general to a sense of security and peace. But the heights are gradually and implacably being levelled to the ground, and in the place of goodly mountains we have infinite flats of grains of sand, shifting or stationary, but incapable of construction.

Portugal is necessarily one of the countries which suffers most from the modern craze for levelling, since in Portugal the peaks were solitary, not rising, as in Spain, from solid mountain ranges, but soaring skyward from the plain. The Portuguese genius and Portuguese literature, in prose and verse, are essentially lyrical. It is a lyrical impulse, a personal subjective mood that, under the influence of a marvellous national achievement, inspires the prose epic even of a Barros, who considers himself as an ensign bearing aloft the banner of his

country's triumphs; while the epic of Camões is as lyrical as the drama of Vicente. In this respect the Portuguese are the exact opposite of the Basques, who have a very high level of excellence but few outstanding peaks (a Loyola, a Xavier), whereas in Portugal excellence is subjected to a strong democratic probing of rivalry, envy, or indifference, and either succumbs or attains an heroic quality, a soaring eminence. The Portuguese, penetrating and restless as water, have a truly democratic and incomparable gift for destruction and minute insatiable criticism. Albuquerque was the victim of armchair politicians at home; and of the carping of literary critics, "men with their fill of good food and secure sleep, free from disquiet", as an author complains in one of King Manuel's books (1556), there is abundant evidence. Those who survived the adverse conditions were very great; steadfast rocks in a watery wilderness. Such eminences we have in the Holy Constable Nun' Alvarez, the chronicler Fernam Lopez, the dramatist Gil Vicente, the poet Camões, the historian Barros, the humanist Osorio, the scientist Pedro Nunes, the mystic Frei Thomé de Jesus, the Initiator (as King Manuel would have us call him) Prince Henry the Navigator, the discoverer Vasco da Gama, the hero Duarte Pacheco, the adventurer Fernam Mendez Pinto, the conqueror Albuquerque.

King Manuel takes these and other exceptional figures and all the various corner-stones of Portugal's greatness; the religious orders (the learned and enduring work of the Cistercians at Alcobaça, for instance) or the services by which as missionaries the Franciscans rivalled the Jesuits in the oversea possessions of Portugal (the King gives an account of the work at Ormuz of one of the early Jesuit missionaries, Gaspar Barzeo); the Monastery of Santa Cruz at Coimbra, whose Prior had the right to wear the vestments of a bishop; the three military orders—

the Order of Christ was heir to the Templars, and afterwards, in the new crusade carried on in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it helped on the navigation and discoveries so greatly

## 90 King Manuel and Portuguese Literature

that without it those pages in our history that have done most to render famous the name of Portugal might not have been written. The Order of St. James [the Knights of Santiago] had an important share in the foundation of our nationality, especially in the Crusade against the Moors, freeing our native land from Saracen dominion. The Order of Avis played a similar part in founding the nation in early times and in the struggle against the infidels ;

the University of Coimbra ; the work of the princes and kings of the House of Avis ; the Jews (represented during the discoveries by the science of Zacuto), great in their services and their excesses : of these and other inspiring elements the King gradually and with no mean skill composes his full picture, rich in glancing lights and glowing splendour. As in Spain, Queen Isabel the Catholic, Cardinal Mendoza, Cardinal Cisneros, the Emperor Charles V, with wills of iron and an unswerving faith, forged Spain's two centuries of greatness, so in Portugal the Holy Constable, the Master of Avis, Prince Henry the Navigator and King João II. The link in the great chain, the capture of Ceuta, the exploration of the West Coast of Africa, the rounding of the Cape, the arrival at Calicut, the triumphs of Albuquerque, were, as King Manuel insists throughout his work, part of a well-considered and scientifically ordered plan. The result of its success and the more sudden and unheralded success of Columbus for Spain was to place these two countries in the very front of European civilization during the Renaissance ; yet by one of the strangest paradoxes all historians of the Renaissance have passed over Spain and Portugal in complete or nearly complete silence, as though they had scarcely existed or known what culture was during that period.

Portugal [says King Manuel] created a Renaissance, and though this superhuman effort may have exhausted the energies of the country and made her bleed, we can never forget that the light she kindled was so brilliant that it still casts a glow upon the history of Portugal.

For those who turn to the literature and art of that period in Portugal the enduring glow is evident enough.

Really Sagres (Prince Henry's watch-tower) and Constantinople may be said to have been the two hinges on which the magic door of the Renaissance swung open. The East contributed its stores of ancient learning, the West its spirit of enquiry and its practical activity. It is sometimes deemed that Portugal failed to profit by the Renaissance which she had helped so greatly to usher in. But we have the facts before us, artistic and literary treasures which speak for themselves (they speak most eloquently in the King's catalogue of his own books). The Inquisition, the censorship, and the *autos da fe* did not prevent a flowering of literary masterpieces such as the world has rarely seen, and even of many scientific works, such as the *De Crepusculis* of Pedro Nunes and the *Colloquios* of Orta. The patriotism of the individual soared beyond his personal interests and sufferings to a wider range of humanity. King Manuel admirably defends King João III against the common charge of bigoted fanaticism. This lover and encourager of learning and literature was not as splendid as his predecessor King Manuel the Fortunate; he was the prey of many sorrows, and, although he was only fifty-five when he died, his nine children had predeceased him. Personal grief can scarcely be alleged as an excuse for the burning of heretics, but the King only adopted the Inquisition as a necessary evil to prevent greater evils. In these our, ostensibly, milder days one may dislike intensely the thought of confining anyone during his life between four walls, yet may hesitate before advocating the abolition of prisons.

"We lament that the name of God should have been connected with the burning of human beings," says King Manuel II; but he points out that the Inquisition helped to maintain security and peace. It thus indirectly served the cause of culture in Portugal as well as imperial interests. "Many Portuguese authors," as the King says, "have entered the lists on behalf of liberty (a magnificent theory, all too seldom put in practice) and use it as a pretext to attack the Inquisition and all the so-called crimes it committed." In reality, of course, the alleged crushing of individual liberty in the Peninsula



## 92 King Manuel and Portuguese Literature

during the sixteenth century is one of those egregious myths which owe their long life to the propensity of many writers to study books about the sixteenth century rather than go to the fountain-head, to the facts and literature of that century itself. In one respect, no doubt, in the falling off of Portuguese printing after 1550, the Counter-Reformation, in its distrust of foreigners and in foreigners' corresponding distrust of it, was probably injurious, since the early masterpieces of printing in Portugal were the work of foreigners settled in Portugal; for instance, the *Boosco Deleytoso* by Hermão de Campos (Kempis), or the incomparable incunable, the *Vita Christi* by Valentim Fernandes of Moravia and Nicolao of Saxony.

Portugal in her newly achieved splendour at the opening of the sixteenth century, the successor to the prosperity of Venice (when the Ambassador of Venice in Lisbon in 1502 stood godfather to the future King João III he must have realized that it was much like nourishing a viper in his bosom) drew many travellers from foreign lands, including humanists such as Matheu de Pisano (possibly a brother, not a son, of the celebrated Christine), the beautiful illustration from whose rediscovered manuscript opens King Manuel's book; Vasaeus; Clenardus (whose letters from Portugal are a joy to scholars); Élie Vinet; Nicholas Grouchy; Buchanan; Azpilcueta; Fray Luis de Granada; and many more. Buchanan, who could write a poem entitled "*Desiderium Lutetiae*", showed no such regret, no *desiderium Lusitaniae*, on leaving Portugal. After his term of imprisonment (by the Inquisition: envy, in this case that of Diogo de Gouvea, having played a principal part in the arrest), he shook the dust of the Peninsula from his feet with a farewell to Portugal in which he quite perversely derided the

Jejuna miserae tesqua Lusitaniae,  
Glebaeque tantum fertiles penuriae.

(*Poemata*, 1676 ed. p. 282.)

And this was the fertile soil of Portugal, the country which had introduced Europe to the fruits and spices

## King Manuel and Portuguese Literature 93

and tobacco of the East, the country which gave Azpilcueta the princely salary of a thousand ducats (professors at Salamanca were glad if they got two hundred). But if Buchanan's *bête noire* was the Portuguese scholar Belchior Beleago, he shows in other Latin poems that he was an intimate friend and admirer of at least three distinguished Portuguese scholars, André de Gouvea, Antonio de Gouvea, and Diogo de Teive.

Et te nostro ego Tevio inviderem  
Et nostrum tibi Tevium inviderem,

he writes to Antonio de Gouvea (*Poemata*, ed. cit., p. 326).

The group of Portuguese humanists was indeed remarkable, but modern critics and historians have unfortunately neglected them, and the information is of the scantiest. The care with which King Manuel investigates their life and writings would in itself make his book indispensable to scholars. There was the dynasty of the Gouveas, one of whom, Principal André, won glowing praise from the pen of Montaigne (in France he was known by the nickname of Sinapivorus, or Engoulvemoutarde); the great scholar and antiquarian of Évora, André de Resende; Diogo de Teive (Tevius), who took a degree in civil law at the University of Paris and was the colleague of the Gouveas at the Collège de Guyenne at Bordeaux; Jorge Coelho, one of a considerable number of Greek scholars in Portugal; Duarte de Resende, early translator of Cicero; Achilles Estaço; Damião de Goes, scholar, historian, musician, traveller and intimate friend of Erasmus; and Ayres Barbosa, the father of Greek studies not only in Portugal but in the Iberian Peninsula as a whole.

Not less remarkable was the group of historians: the classic Barros, Lopez de Castanheda, vivid and unconventional Correa, are only the principal names in a great company. The poets were almost every Portuguese, however high his station, who could write, and many who could not. The fascinating thirteenth-century lyrics find no place in the Renaissance except

## 94 King Manuel and Portuguese Literature

in so far as they were brought to the surface in the general upheaval and left lovely echoes in the lyrics of Gil Vicente's plays. But the poets produced by Portugal in the fifteenth and sixteenth century were by no means blind followers of first the Spanish, then the Italian manner. It is noteworthy that in the year 1530 Portugal possessed three great poets of genius so different as Vicente, Sá de Miranda, and Camões (Vicente then at the end of a long life, Miranda at the height of his faculties, Camões soon to begin his fruitful years of study in the University of Coimbra). Two other poets, Diogo Bernardez and Antonio Ferreira, were just born.

Everyone who studies the Portugal of the Renaissance must be struck by the great variety of the achievement. To confine ourselves to literature alone, when we have duly, and not dully, studied the historians and the poets, the scholars, the mystics (Punto, Arraez, and especially the incomparable Frei Thomé de Jesus), we are constantly arrested by stray volumes of a fascinating strangeness or artistic beauty (or both together), visions of distant lands and adventure filled with curious information; or spiritual adventures, literary travels and enquiries told in that prose of which the sixteenth century had the secret: the passionate little romance by Bernardim Ribeiro, the *Diana* of Montemôr (Jorge de Montemayor), the brief but pregnant treatise of Antonio Galvam, the vivid narratives of shipwreck (the King's catalogue contains two of these, the loss of the *S. Bento* and the loss of the *Santa Maria da Barca*, the *Verdadera Informaçam* of Francisco Alvarez (translated into many languages), the *Itinerario* of Tenreiro, the letters of Albuquerque, Castro's *Roteiros*, the *Consolaçam* of Samuel Usque (to this book, intrinsically of great value and involving the problem of the Jews in Portugal, King Manuel devotes nearly a hundred pages), the *Peregrinaçam* of Fernam Mendez Pinto, the *Colloquios* of Garcia da Orta, filled with the atmosphere of the East, the "profitable tales" of Trancoso, the Dialogues of Hollanda with their intimate glimpses of Michel Angelo.

The variety of King Manuel II's interests and the extraordinary extent of his reading (his quotations are

in Latin, German, French, Italian and Spanish) correspond grandly to these riches, and made him an admirable historian of this epoch. On more than one page we may see his devotion to music or his interest in science. He evidently delights in the rich and ingenuous quaintness of the fifteenth-century *Boosco Deleytoso*, in the living personal prose of the chronicler Fernam Lopez, in the national accents of Vicente (who was something more than the founder of the Portuguese drama—the poet laureate of the Portuguese Empire), in the unacademic history of Gaspar Correa or the curious rhymed Miscellany of the editor of the *Cancioneiro Geral*, Garcia de Resende. The great historical figures, Albuquerque, Prince Henry the Navigator; the Holy Constable (still without a monument in Portugal); the Perfect Prince King João II (into whose character King Manuel shows an admirable insight); the magnificent and talented King Manuel I; the Canons of Santa Cruz or the Blue Canons of St. Eloy; the antiquities of the city of Evora; the origin of the name of Portugal and of the name “Lusiads”; nautical science in Portugal; typography and the early Portuguese printers (printers in Portugal); such historical events as the siege of Diu; the history of the Archbishops of Lisbon and the Archbishops of Braga: these and many other subjects of interest no less deep and various won and kept the careful attention of the scholar King.

But indeed “il rimembrar delle passate cose” had a natural fascination for him. Many of his books brought the past and the distant dead vividly before him, and they are brought by him vividly before his readers. There was the copy of the poems of Boscan and Garci Lasso (1543) once in the possession of the Dauphin of France and Queen Mary Stuart; there was Pastrana’s *Grammar* (1512), which “has also the charm of the past”; very possibly King Manuel I, who was “much inclined to learning and well versed in the Latin tongue”, used this copy as his textbook. Constantly the King refers to this historical charm. There are also more personal references, and the whole work might in a sense be called the King’s *Livro das Saudades*. Of the Evora edition of Ribeiro’s *Menina e Moça* he writes that “for us it has

## 96 King Manuel and Portuguese Literature

a special charm because the beautiful word *saudade*, untranslatable into English, has a special meaning for us and signifies memories of the past and a great love of nature in that dear land from which, alas, we are far away". The Portuguese peasantry, ever prone to believe in the mythical and fantastic and to look for returns and apparitions, believe that King Manuel II repeatedly visited Portugal in disguise during his exile and went to St. Vicente (the church in Lisbon where he now lies) to pray by the coffins of his murdered father and elder brother; but at least it is certain that he would have desired no greater favour from the Portuguese Republic than the gracious permission to return, even when dead, to the country which he loved so well.

At the end of his long note (a volume in itself) on Usque's *Consolaçam*, the King refers to the event which changed his life and brought such havoc to Portugal, the dastardly assassination of the King and Crown Prince of Portugal in the presence of the courageous and charitable and, by men and fate, most cruelly treated Queen Amélie. It is to be feared that in the fall of the Monarchy which followed two and a half years later some injustice has tacitly been done to King Manuel. When he so suddenly embarked with the Queens at Ericeira, this was attributed to weakness due to youth and inexperience. But since then we have seen other thrones fall in swift renunciation without resistance. King Manuel, who had frequently shown courage during his brief reign, ever threatened with political assassination, knew, none better, how Portugal had been undermined by a generation of insidious politics and secret societies, and how resistance on his part would have been worse than useless, political trickery having cut the tie connecting King and people.

A sharp line is drawn in these volumes between Spain and Portugal; yet the volumes are themselves a proof of how inextricably the two countries are bound up in constant interactions to form a greater whole. The Portuguese Court was almost always partly Spanish. Nearly all the Portuguese writers of the sixteenth century wrote also in Spanish, and Camões keenly admired the clear

flow of Castilian verse (a testimony which, coming from a master of mellifluous versification, should be pondered by those who affect to consider Castilian harsh and refractory to the Muse). Portuguese humanists studied at Salamanca and at Alcalá and even held Chairs in the Spanish Universities; Spanish humanists came to Portugal. Barbosa Machado claims Fray Diego de Estella, a master of Castilian prose (whose life of St. John was published at Lisbon in 1554) for Portugal by birth; Nicolás Antonio was doubtful on this point. Fray Luis de Montoya, Luis de Leon's cousin, lived long in Portugal and became Confessor to the Portuguese King. Fray Luis de Granada lived and wrote and died there. Francisco de Monzón, author of the *Especjo del Principe Christiano* (Lisbon, 1544) and the *Norte de Confessores* (Lisbon, 1546), was invited, with other distinguished foreigners, to Coimbra University by King João III. Azpilcueta, the celebrated "Navarrese Doctor" spent seventeen years of his long life in Portugal. St. Francis Xavier became the leading missionary in the Portuguese possessions in the East.

The Spanish *romances* became popular in Portugal and soon extended as far as the Azores. The romances of chivalry likewise achieved popularity in Portugal, and several written in Spanish were published at Lisbon.

We consider indeed [says King Manuel II] that the fictitious exploits must have been an incentive to the Portuguese heroes to perform real deeds of valour, and so, in constant struggles, not against giants and dragons, but against the infidels, not in the artificialities of the tourney, but in desperate combat, they were able, in the service of God and their country, to attain the coveted honours of chivalry.

There was a danger in this emulation of fantastic exploits, the danger of not adequately calculating the means required for the end desired. The more serious writers of the time considered the reading of these books plainly pernicious, as ruinous to youth as some moralists of to-day consider the cinematograph. To the denunciatory passages given in Professor Castro's *El Pensamiento de Cervantes* (1925), on page 26, we may add the following:



## 98 King Manuel and Portuguese Literature

F. A. de Herrera (1517); Dr. João de Barros, not the historian (1540); Francisco de Monzón (1544); Luis de Lucena (1552); Matamoros (1553); Granada, *Adiciones al Memorial de la Vida Christiana*; Huarte (1575); Miguel Sanchez (1580); Acosta (1589); Fray Francisco Ortiz y Lucio, *Libro intitulado Iardin de Amores Santos* (1589); Juan de Tolosa, *Discursos Predicables* (1589); Mariana (1592); Sigüenza (1595).

King Manuel considered that the Archbishop of Braga, the saintly Frei Bartholameu dos Martyres, when he took the oath of King Philip II of Spain as King of Portugal, did so against his will: "It is easy to imagine how so Portuguese a Prelate must have suffered as he listened to the fatal words." Certainly there was sadness for all patriotic Portuguese in the ending of the brilliant dynasty of Avis and the circumstances attending it. But what was best to be done under these fatal circumstances which could not now be altered? Fray Luis de Granada, who wrote the life of the Portuguese saint and archbishop, speaks of "la rectitud y entereza que habia tenido en las alteraciones pasadas del reino", a clear indication that the Archbishop of Braga had not been hostile to the pretensions of King Philip. Frei Bartholameu's character was independent, as he showed at Rome, where he was cordially received by the Pope, whom he advised to dine off porcelain instead of silver; his modesty was shown when he arrived at the Convent of San Esteban at Salamanca as a simple monk, and it was only by an accident that he was recognized and received with due honour by the Dominican friars. Personally of a great humility, he was zealous for the dignity of his high office; and perhaps the thought in his mind at the ceremony of the year 1581 at Thomar may have been rather the honour done to the See which, with Zaragoza, Tarragona, and Santiago de Compostela, but with more reason and persistency than they, disputed with Toledo the right to the primacy of all the Spains. At the beginning of the sixteenth century it had been expected and hoped that the two countries, Portugal and Spain, would become united under the rule of a single monarch. Death frustrated these hopes, but the destiny of these

countries during that great century was in many respects similar, and not least in that which gave to the Renaissance in Spain and in Portugal, as in England, a special character, due to the historical circumstances which caused most men of letters in those countries to be men of action also, wielding alternately sword and pen. This fact gave to the Renaissance there a broad and generous basis, embracing the ancient culture but also the new knowledge derived from personal adventure in the East; and if pure scholarship suffered, literature gained by remaining personal, human, vivid and un-academic.

No one who reads King Manuel's volumes will doubt the splendour and variety of Portugal in that golden age of her faith in God and man. The amount of work devoted to these two magnificent volumes only a scholar can perhaps fully realize. The scrupulous collation of each book and the generous wealth of interest provided by the King's commentary have their counterpart in the quantity and the quality of the illustrations. Nor amid their splendour are quaint touches wanting; in an illustration of 1514 we see a peasant digging with a modern *enxada*; and Tenreiro crossing the desert (1560) might almost be a photograph of some discoverer of the present time. The reader feels almost that he is in actual possession of the rare, sometimes unique copies of the books from which the illustrations are so liberally reproduced. The volumes, moreover, are so admirably bound that if they are laid open on a table or book-rest they can be handled freely without fear of spoiling their treasures of print and illustration.

Throughout the work, the King's thought was of Portugal; a glowing patriotism appears on almost every page. The thought of Portugal and of what was due to her great historical achievement both increased and lightened his labour. The last words that he wrote were: "The work we have undertaken with but only one aim: to serve our country." His early death is an irreparable loss both to his country and to literature, as well as to many personal friends. Messrs. Maggs published vol ii in the very week of its author's sudden death. The King

## 100 King Manuel and Portuguese Literature

was ready to devote himself with equally unflagging study to the composition of the third and final volume, which would have derived a special value from his possession of the first and other rare editions of *The Lusíads*. On the other hand the King's interest tended to die with his country and with Camões and Osorio in 1580 (eleven years after the close of the King's second volume); and the principal part of his work was accomplished. It (that is to say vol. i) met with wide recognition among scholars. The Pope especially (and his Holiness was formerly a distinguished librarian) at once realized its great value.

The name of King Alfonso of Castille is not more inseparably connected with his beloved *Cantigas de Santa Maria*, the name of King Duarte of Portugal does not live more securely in his *Leal Conselheiro*, than that of King Manuel II of Portugal will live and glow in the glowing pages of the *Livros Antigos Portuguezes*. The book will serve to encourage the study of Portuguese history and literature; and it should induce other possessors of literary treasures to study and impart them. King Manuel would have wished for no better reward than that the past glories (too often little more than a name) of his country should become more intimately and accurately known. He has left all scholars in his debt, and has provided the best contribution yet produced in any language to that history of the Renaissance in Portugal which remains to be written. With its parallel columns in Portuguese and English the King's book is, as he remarked, another link and alliance between Portugal and England. Let us hope that it will be an English scholar who will pay the best homage to these volumes by devoting a lifetime to the composition of a work on the Portuguese Renaissance. Towards such a consummation King Manuel II has nobly pointed the way.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

## ART. 8.—THE ISSUES OF CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGY

*Religion and the Rise of Capitalism.* By R. H. Tawney. (John Murray.)

*Equality.* By R. H. Tawney. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.)

*Wealth and Life.* By J. A. Hobson. (Macmillan & Co. Ltd.)

**T**HERE are two main branches of Catholic sociology. One has to do with the social organism, the other with the economic life which feeds it and to some extent determines its form. In an article entitled "An Introduction to Catholic Sociology", published in this review in July 1933, M. de la Bédoyère referred to the fact that the "organization of the economic world has reached such a degree of complexity, and in so doing has impinged at so many points on the other aspects of the life of the individual, that the latter (the only ultimate object of the Church's social concern) is trapped body and, too often, soul as well in a machinery which no one thought out, which no one properly understands, with which no one can do more than tinker", and pleaded rightly that the time had come for Catholic sociologists to "take an 'experimental plunge into the unknown, risking mistakes and ready to acknowledge them". But if the pioneers in this branch are to reap the full reward of their adventures, a preliminary or at least simultaneous work must be done in the other branch: the work of clearing away erroneous assumptions about the human factors of society and their connexion with economic activities, and of determining what is and what is not consistent with the Christian concept of society. We are not mere analysts. Our work is positive and practical. We shall never reform the existing social order by deciding that this or that feature is not immoral. We have to determine whether or not each legitimate feature conduces to an intended whole, and to reject it if it does not. This is a point which many Catholic students have not seen. To apply the principles of Christian morals to the details of our complicated economic world without reference to the sort of society which

the Christian religion envisages would be merely to accumulate a mass of pointless casuistic knowledge. What we need is not casuistry *ad infinitum*, but sociological decisions. It is a waste of time to compile volumes of information about things which may have to be scrapped. The whole economic order, and every part of it, must be judged by the objective society at which social justice aims. Sociology can be Catholic only if it is teleological. Although modern society has not been made to an antecedent model, it is not a blind growth. Its evolution is the expression of a definite philosophy. But the Catholic Church, in addition to her philosophy, has in mind an exemplar of society built up from Our Lord's teaching about men's relations with each other in justice and charity. Her principles are indeed tests which lay bare the ethical composition of this or that detail, method, or feature, but they should be applied with the purpose of finding out what does and what does not make for a general end already in view. The sociological method in this matter is comparison; comparison between an actual human structure and a divine plan. The plan exists and can be consulted. It is in the keeping of the Catholic Church.

Before he can do what M. de la Bédoyère calls for, the Catholic sociologist has, therefore, to resolve a domestic difficulty. The first problem of Catholic sociology is within itself. It is created by some of the Church's own relations with the society which has grown up since the Reformation, and by the nature of certain social and economic evils. For a statement of it one cannot do better than go back to Mr. R. H. Tawney's *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, where it is first set out in detail, and then summarized, in a style whose rhythm and play of antithesis are admirably suited to reasoned and illuminating exposition. A Catholic is tempted to quote Mr. Tawney extensively, not only for his understanding and scholarly temper, but for the joy of dwelling in good prose on ideas which our theological reviewers and writers of textbooks translate from the formal scholastic Latin into a hybrid English. The first and last chapters of *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*

are particularly pertinent to the thesis of this paper. The author contrasts the social claims and concepts of the Church just before the Reformation with the place assigned to religion in the general life of England by the time of the Restoration, and gives, as the key to the change, the secularization of political, social, and economic philosophy owing to the rise of a naturalistic science of society; "the general acceptance by thinkers of a scale of ethical values which turned the desire for pecuniary gain from a perilous if natural frailty into the idol of philosophers, and the mainspring of society"; and "the abdication of the Christian Churches from departments of economic conduct and social theory long claimed as their province". One may hesitate over the word 'abdicate' as applied to the Catholic Church, but, although she was deposed, her long period of inactivity and acquiescence after she had recovered sufficient toleration to be able to speak in the name of social justice amounts to a virtual abdication. And it cannot be denied that the Church, even since her return to influence, has compromised in practice with the order which has resulted from the secularist philosophy, and, in trying to make it into a working scheme, has condoned the dualism which it involves. Therefore the most pressing work for the Catholic sociologist is to regenerate social and economic thought within the Church in Protestant and industrial countries, and to restore the Christian exemplar of common human life. He must clear away all those assumptions and values which she has adopted in many of her relations with modern society, not from choice but from expediency, and which she has been able to adopt because, although they are foreign to her spirit and philosophy, they are not immoral individually and in their essence. But toleration is not approval, and a moral negative is not a social positive. Prevented from doing the best job possible, the Church has tried to make the best of a bad job, and the danger has arisen that the result may be taken as satisfactory. Adjustments which have been necessary for her very existence in a hostile society, and for social discipline as well, have been regarded as precedents, and false inferences have



been drawn from them. An internal problem has thus been created, and an attempt is made in this article to suggest the lines of solution.

If a thing is wrong as a whole, though right in parts, it must be condemned as a whole. If a thing is right, or at any rate not wrong, as a whole, though wrong in parts, it may not be condemned as a whole. It may be supported or at least tolerated. What matters is the philosophy which underlies it. In the second case wrongs can be righted within the system; in the first case the whole system must be changed. No ambiguity is possible in the Church's relations with communism; she simply rejects it. But a great deal of ambiguity is possible in her relations with capitalism because she does not reject it as a whole. Let us be clear as to what we mean by capitalism. The name is given to two quite different things. Mr. Belloc and others use it to denote a society in which the bulk of land and capital is owned and controlled by a comparatively few people, whilst the rest have no such property, and are therefore proletarian. This is not the sense in which we use it here; and it is not the sense in which it is used in the great sociological encyclicals. It is not a definition of capitalism, but of the greatest evil of capitalism; perhaps of its chief characteristic in its present form. In itself, capitalism is that society in which (though some people provide both capital and labour themselves, whilst others may be labourers in one industry and capitalists in another, and others again, though manual workers, may own houses and land) capital is, as a working rule, provided and administered by one set of people and labour supplied by another. Both Leo XIII and Pius XI are emphatic that the capitalist system, with its method of payment by wages, is not wrong in itself; and still more emphatic that "the immense number of propertyless wage-earners on the one hand, and the superabundant riches of the fortunate few on the other, is an unanswerable argument that the earthly goods so abundantly produced in this age of industrialism are far from rightly distributed". On the same page on which these words occur, Pius XI uses language the trend of which is unmistakable, about

the increase, along with the progress of machinery, of "the number of the dispossessed labouring masses", and about "the immense army of hired rural labourers . . . who have no hope of ever obtaining a share in the land", and who, "unless efficacious remedies be applied, will remain perpetually sunk in their proletarian condition". The distinction here made between the two things is unmistakable. Many students of Catholic sociology are at loggerheads because they have confused them. That capitalism has resulted in the deprivation of the mass of the people of property in land and industrial capital is a moral and social calamity, and may be fatal to the system ; but it is not inherent in it. It is due to a number of historical, geographical, geological, and sociological circumstances which, in combination, determined the form it has actually taken. The most immediate of these were the concentration of wealth which took place before the industrial age began, and the discovery of steam power. Let us consider this latter. Steam power is responsible for the concentration of machinery in big factories, the consequent concentration of the ownership of industrial capital, and the concentration of masses of people in great towns. It is concentric by nature. The machinery which it drives has to be assembled around it, and the people who work the machines must be brought round the factories and workshops which contain them. So the factories grew round the engines, the slums round the factories, the shops round the slums, and the suburbs at a distance determined by the transport of the times. The formation of the modern industrial town was dictated by steam power. But if electrical power had been discovered first all this would have been unnecessary, as it is capable of wide diffusion. A totally different organization of industry would probably have resulted, in spite of other factors, with an ampler diffusion of capital and a population better spaced : in a word, a capitalist society different from the one which we know. Steam concentrated transport on to railways. Petrol and the internal combustion engine have distributed it once more over the roads, and have created a large number of owners and owner-drivers of

motor vehicles and working proprietor-employers of motor garages and workshops. The railways no longer dictate industrial sites. A distribution is going on at the present time without any noticeable change in our general economy, but whether it is possible, now, to return to an equitable distribution of property on a large scale within the capitalist system, or whether such an attempt at redistribution will end in a new economic order, remains to be seen ; but in theory, at least, it is not impossible. It could conceivably be done by a combination of Catholic philosophy and electricity. If Ireland is ever industrialized through the Shannon Scheme, it will be interesting to see whether she will copy, like Soviet Russia (its capital mistake and the measure of the futility of its philosophy), the structure of the steam age, or whether she will create by her own genius and her Catholic philosophy a new capitalist society, moulded by the distributive nature of electrical power, and characterized by well-distributed industrial capital. Her peasants chose instinctively to acquire the land for themselves, through Wyndham's Land Purchase scheme, rather than to hold it as tenants from the State ; so that there is already a fairly equitable distribution of the ownership of land.

As far as Catholic sociology is concerned, the first problem of economic life is that of distributing equitably the wealth produced by capitalism. It is assumed that the bulk should go to those who provide and administer capital. Why ? Is this assumption moral ? Should a shareholder in a business receive a better remuneration than a workman who puts his health, strength, intelligence, and skill into it ? And if so, why ? Does every sort of risk merit a proportionate reward ? What then are we to say of gambling and the risk to life in dangerous trades ? The idea underlying the remuneration of loans and investments in most people's minds is money producing money and not money producing goods through land and labour. The endless inbreeding of money, reproducing productivity in the abstract, with the imperishability of a recurring decimal, whilst sooner or later all real productivity fails and all real products perish, is

one of the reasons why the economic world is so potentially wonderful and so actually chaotic. It is one of the strongest arguments in favour of Dr. Ingram's contention that political economy should be fused in a complete science of society, and it will help towards the fulfilment of Mr. J. A. Hobson's prophecy that economics will, in course of time, become a group of studies pursued in the interest of social philosophy and subordinated to the wider study embracing the whole of human conduct. (*Wealth and Life*, p. 137.) M. de la Bédoyère wants Catholic sociologists to apply to it the mediaeval doctrine of usury, but it would appear that at present, whilst not a few of our moralists are straining principles in order to adjust them to economic actualities and social convenience, there is a wide movement amongst non-Catholics of great authority in economics to correct anti-social economic processes by ethical principles. Mr. Hobson's chapter on *Economic and Ethical Values* is instructive on this subject, and, as he remarks, it is not without significance that the most advanced movement towards a recognition of the subordination of economics to ethics should, in England, come from leading experts in that branch of economic study where the subject matter is most abstract, viz. finance.

The next step in our thesis sets us upon territory different from that which we have just traversed, but with similar features. Things which are materially and socially bad may be occasions of spiritual good to numerous individuals. They may not be evils in themselves at all. The Church's relations with such things are necessarily complex; and unless they are carefully studied they give rise to misunderstandings and confusion. The primary concern of the Church is the individual soul. She is interested in a man's social and economic circumstances only in so far as they affect his soul. Some of the most outstanding social evils are at the same time counsels of perfection and occasions of sin. Poverty, servitude, material degradation, repulsiveness, hunger, are amongst the most objectionable features of society and have dreadful moral consequences; yet voluntary poverty and entire obedience, humiliation and the

mortification of the senses, are the technique of the Christian life. The poor not only have the gospel preached to them; they are imprisoned in a framework of its precepts and counsels. These things are susceptible of two conflicting sets of values. On the other hand, pride, avarice, luxury, cruelty, and oppression are sins, yet throughout history they have been associated with the governing classes, and therefore with social stability, which it is the Church's duty to support for the sake of the individual. To the oppressed she has often seemed to be on the side of sin. Besides, the exigencies of order, natural inequalities, and differences of merit and effort, as well as force, fraud, inheritance, and luck, produce unequal stations and standards of life. There are just as well as unjust inequalities. Thus we find the Church in liaison with, and often in apparent sympathy with, elements of the social order which are alien to her spirit, and which it is the duty of loyal Catholic sociologists to criticize. But all that she has done is to tolerate under diplomatic protest, so to speak, certain things which, though objectionable, can, by divine charity, be turned into instruments of salvation. The first thing, therefore, that the Catholic sociologist has to note is that the Church's association with any form of society in her essential work of saving souls never compromises her or commits her to anything irrevocable. She may have been weak or wise. Her ministers are not supermen but men of their time, formed by the influences of their age, country and class. Besides, in all urgent undertakings there is first a phase of unreflective activity too direct and concentrated for critical notice of side issues. Reflection and criticism may follow and make amendments for future use. When we speak of the Church in this connexion, we must keep in mind the distinction between the Church's considered judgment and deliberate policy, which direct the activities of her hierarchy, and the varying lines of action taken by her representative ministers in matters which are, as yet, open to opinion. These latter reflect all sorts of differences and interests. A West End priest of upper or middle-class birth and education will see almost everything quite differently

from an East End priest of working-class birth and seminary education. Those religious orders which have adopted the English public-school system have a vested interest in great concentrations of wealth. Public schools and "exclusive" convents are impossible without such concentrations. The Church has to be all things to all men—a universality indeed; and whatever be her fundamental unity she must present an inexhaustible variety, from the priest-schoolmaster who will raise cultured eyebrows at the mention of social reform, to the apostolic but rough-and-ready curate who appears to think that good manners are a sign of doubtful orthodoxy.

Up to the time of Leo XIII the Church as such, though, of course, conscious of the shortcomings of our society, had given it no detailed or comprehensive critical attention, such as she had given, for instance, to Continental liberalism. The encyclical *Rerum Novarum* brought it for the first time to the bar of Catholic judgment. From that time onward no Catholic could be indifferent about it, or plead a dualism of religion and secular life. It was the rebirth of Catholic sociology. The present Pope has amplified Leo's teaching and applied it to the changes which have taken place over more than a generation. He reprimands those who have been indifferent or hostile to Leo's judgments. The Church has now reached the phase of criticism in her relations with the present social order, and has already cleared away many of the confusions and uncertainties which her secondary relations with it had created. It is quite clear now that, whatever accidental alliances and compromises she may have made in the past, they will not be allowed to hamper her social work in the future. A writer in this review has pointed out recently that at the end of the struggle of the Reformation "the Church no longer protested against social injustice; it had become the ally of the ruling powers and the tool of vested interests", and that in our own time it has been regarded as "a servant of the established order". (Christopher Dawson, *Dublin Review*, Jan. 1933.) But it is abundantly clear that the Church is



anxious to do practical justice now, and wants the help of all those who can unravel the intricacies and complications of the economical and financial processes which threaten to entangle her principles in their meshes. Two things especially stand out : that extreme wealth and power, and extreme poverty and dependence, involve injustice, and cannot be made moral by charity alone ; and that there can be no dualism of moral and secular life. "For though economic science and moral discipline are guided each by its own principles in its own sphere, it is false that the two orders are so distinct and alien that the former in no way depends on the latter. The so-called laws of economics derived from the nature of earthly goods and from the qualities of the human body and soul, determine what aims are unattainable or attainable in economic matters, and what means are thereby necessary ; whilst reason itself clearly deduces from the nature of things and from the individual and social character of man what is the end and object of the whole economic order assigned by God the Creator." (*The Social Order*, p. 19.)

So far we have dealt with matters which have presented the Church with serious difficulties on account of their having a double character : now we come to defects for which there is no excuse ; in which there has been no element of dilemma ; which are the direct result of human respect and pandering to patronage ; in which doctrine and practice are at variance. We will deal with three of them. They are : social values, the dignity of labour, and the relation between production and life.

(i) The Church has been content to concentrate on spiritual worth, and has been inclined to treat social discriminations as secondary, and to accept them uncritically. But there are, as a consequence of Christian values, as well as from the nature of things, true and false social values, and unless true social values are established the spiritual values themselves are vitiated ; and the opposition between her spiritual and social assessments forces on the Church the charges of insincerity and hypocrisy. For after all, social values are seals set by society upon individuals. The modern Church has

been as lax in this respect as the early Church was strict ; perhaps because she came to Roman society from outside, whilst modern paganism has grown up around her. An interesting comparison might be made between actual social and economic values. It is natural in our present society that, although they may not always coincide, they should be closely allied. In general, necessities are cheap, luxuries dear. Between necessity and luxury there are many degrees of utility. Utility is a very relative thing. It is true to say that, in many instances, things are valued highly in economic life according to their un-necessity (if the word may be permitted), and people in social life according to their inutility. It is assumed that people who can live without working are superior in quality to those who have to work for their living. "The old order changeth", and it is not so long ago that a nobleman who descended to trade was declassed. Nowadays tradesmen are ennobled. The argument which we are going to put forward is all the easier for the abdication of the old aristocracy, which constituted the governing class and recognized its duties to society. Nowadays wealth has taken the place of lineage, and assured wealth is the condition of permanent social elevation. But though people of wealth and leisure can be exceptionally useful members of society, if they have also character and attainments, that is not their title to superiority. Their title to that is that they can afford to be useless members of society. The general measure of the highest social superiority is merely distance from manual labour and even from professional work. And it cannot be denied that the Church has, in practice, endorsed these social estimates. There is no question here of real and necessary inequalities. We are speaking of something which bears no relation whatsoever to reality ; of valuations which are purely arbitrary and reflect nothing but riches. They are part of our pagan inheritance. The transition from the old order to the new has been a revolution and is a sufficient answer to those who say that it is useless to try to change over from the present order to one based upon the real inequalities of gifts, character,

effort, and function. Surely progress is not necessarily downwards. The psychological ground of such a change has been explored by Mr. Tawney in his book *Equality*, of which the sections on Equality and Culture and the Old Problem in a New Guise are particularly relevant and commendable; and Mr. Hobson's rationalistic attempt to translate economic into human values is worthy of study. His proof of the social character of wealth, and the principle "From each according to his powers to each according to his needs", are perhaps the limit of the rationalistic reach. With one spark of illumination this present-day Saul might be turned into another Paul—an apostle of Christian truth.

(ii) The Church has always insisted on the dignity of labour, but she has countenanced a habit of estimating social values which leaves no room for such a thing. What have labour and dignity in common in the modern industrial world? It is taken for granted that manual labour not only assigns a man to an inferior social place but that it makes him really, humanly, inferior; that of its nature it coarsens, and in a sense degrades him; and that, though perfectly compatible with the higher culture of holiness, it is incompatible with secular culture. That this assumption is not true is capable of present demonstration and historical proof for which there is not space here. The fact is that no work necessary for human life lowers of itself, in any way whatsoever, those who perform it. What does that is the artificial social valuation set upon it. That valuation rests upon the assumption, not of the dignity, but of the indignity of labour. It is anti-Christian. Let it be said at once that inevitable natural inequalities, whether they spring from the nature of society and the necessity of order, or from innate individual qualities or merits, have very little to do with our social values. The unreality of these is demonstrated when they are brought up against education. To educate the working classes and to keep our present arbitrary social valuation of them is to create one of those elemental clashes which end in revolution. To give them culture and at the same time treat them as an inferior kind of humanity, different

not merely in social function and order, but in human quality as well, is to force them to break the mould in which our social order is cast. Universal education will certainly change most of our social values. At best they are part of our unchristened pagan inheritance; at the worst they are creations of our own snobbery. It is essential to Catholic sociology that the Church should be dissociated from them. She must translate the dignity of labour from a phrase in the language of cant into a fact in the practice of life.

(iii) What is the relation between production and life? The sociologist must be all the more insistent in pressing this question because the economist never thinks of it. Life and work minister to each other, of course; but which is the means and which the end? If the advantage of one has to be sacrificed to the advantage of the other which should be sacrificed? The answer of modern industrialist philosophy is simple and clear. It is this: For the few production is for life; for the many life is for production. There are two contrary *raison d'être*. That is the basic reason why capital and labour are always at enmity. It was the underlying assumption of slavery. It might be thought to be the essential moral flaw of capitalism, but that is not true, because the system is compatible with Christian partnership and is capable of paying ample living wages. Once more, this economic dualism is part of our unregenerate inheritance. It is taken for granted in all industrial disputes and social legislation that the employer produces to live, and the workman exists to produce, like a machine. Industrial awards and laws are framed accordingly. Wages are reckoned amongst the costs of production. For the rest, the working classes are the raw material for social experiments. Ever since the industrial system began the elementary decencies of the lives of millions have been sacrificed to the production of wealth for the enjoyment of a comparative few. Labour in conditions injurious to health and the employment of children and married women in certain industries have meant the sacrificing of young life, and of the production of life, to the production of wealth.

And at last the working classes are being urged to practise contraception in order to limit their families to the purchasing power of their wages, the market demand for labour, and the size of the new houses. Even potential life has to be sacrificed to unnatural production. In the article from which I quoted above M. de la Bédoyère said a profoundly true thing in a different connexion. He spoke of "an economic world inheriting the ideas of an age of scarcity". That is, perhaps, the acutest criticism of our pitiful inability to rise to the material greatness which we have unconsciously created. We have even to reconstruct the age of scarcity from which we have never spiritually emerged, by destroying existing stocks of goods and restricting production, and by cutting population to the measure of an age of scarcity.

The gradual breakdown of the arrangement for using the masses for producing wealth for the few is having a sequel of curious interest to the sociologist. Certain safeguards have had to be devised against the effects of the workers' disabilities, and, though servile in character, they have put them in a position of privilege. In this country we have the anomaly of two distinct lines of legislation side by side, individualist for the rich, socialistic for the poor, corresponding to the two main divisions of society. But in a way the poor have the better of it: the moneylenders seem to be always safe, but employers and industrial magnates have to take their chances. On the other hand, when the poor are out of work they get unemployment pay. Their whole position is one of privilege. They are taught, doctored, insured, and pensioned at the expense of the community. They live in subsidized homes. Their position is quasi-servile, but it has a curious counter-effect; it engenders in them the mentality of the man of means or the remittance-man. Our society seems to be a vicious circle in which extremes always meet. Bad trade brings fewer terrors now to employees and more to employers. Economic fear has changed position. Capital and labour, which nature meant to be allies, will always be inimical to each other until the relations of life and production are rationalized by Christian philosophy; until the means and the

end are the same for all men; until the production of wealth ministers equitably to the life of all and capital and labour pull in the same direction, instead of describing a parallelogram of divergent forces. Only then shall we see the end of the monstrosity of a socialistic capitalism, an individualism in which the vast majority have no individuality, and a society reputedly based upon private property in which the bulk of the people have no property at all.

In addition to Catholic philosophy and the Catholic ideal of the social order, the one effective means of rationalizing our society and securing concurrence in equitable inequalities is the diffusion of culture. Men seek or shun one another, cultivate or despise one another, according to their culture. It is culture, and not inequalities of function or wealth, which makes social classes. Every single inequality can be found within the same class. It is true that classes have their origin partly in differences of function and wealth, but only in so far as these offer different opportunities for acquiring culture. But in a society in which wealth was sanely distributed and functions sanely rewarded, a common culture, sufficient to make possible a common intercourse between all classes, would be a matter of course. Classes as we have them are degrees of civilization within society and are incompatible with the complete civilization of society. They are minor forms of the great division between civilization and barbarism. A country "is civilized in so far as its conduct is guided by a just appreciation of spiritual ends, in so far as it uses its material resources to promote the dignity and refinement of the individual human beings who compose it". (*Equality*, p. 103.)

It is indicative either of lethargy or of timidity amongst Catholics in England, due perhaps to their being a small and unpopular minority, that the Catholic will find in the works of non-Catholics like Graham Wallas, J. L. and Barbara Hammond, R. H. Tawney, and even J. A. Hobson, and others (although he will disagree with many of their opinions—especially Hobson's) more material for a Catholic sociology than in those of all but one or



two Catholics writing to-day, in spite of the lead given by Leo XIII and Pius XI. The task before us is staggering, and it will need not only courage but hard thinking and close application as well. It can be done only by the joint efforts of a very large number of workers. Each must remember for his own encouragement that, though separate, he is not one man against a fortress, and that a whole force is converging unseen upon the objective. Ours is a smaller but similar task to that of the early Church. But the early Church started with one advantage over us : it had not to reform itself. It won in the Roman Empire by living its own teaching fearlessly, and that very living produced its Fathers, Doctors, and Saints. The colossal figure of St. Augustine of Hippo standing on their summit is the sum and symbol and embodiment of the mighty effort of those centuries. She won through the Dark Ages, again by living her teaching, and St. Francis of Assisi in life, and St. Thomas Aquinas in thought, emerged as the highest incarnations of her struggle. The lesson for us is plain. Mr. Christopher Dawson has put it into splendid words : "The saint, like every other great man, is the organ of a social purpose, and the success of his mission depends on the reserves of faith and spiritual will that have been accumulated by the anonymous activity of ordinary imperfect men and women, each of whom has made an individual contribution, however minute it may be, to a new order of Christian life."

J. ARTHUR O'CONNOR.

ART. 9.—C. M. DOUGHTY AND A MARONITE MONASTERY

1. *Arabia Deserta*. By C. M. Doughty. (London, 1926.)
2. *Deux Religieux Maronites*. (RR. PP. Alhardini & Kharbel.) Traduit par Joseph Karaméh. (Paris, 1923.)
3. *Statistica con Cenni Storici . . . di Rito Orientale*. (Rome, 1932.)
4. An unpublished letter of Abbot Tarabey.

THE following account of a Catholic Maronite monastery, written some sixty years ago, seems to have escaped the notice of anthologists of the religious life. It is found in chapter xiii of the second volume of C. M. Doughty's *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, published by Messrs. Jonathan Cape Ltd., who have kindly given permission for this long quotation.

I have seen a ready cure, in the East, for distracted persons, under the shadow of religion. Years before when wandering in the high Lebanon I descended into a deep wady—the name of it is in their tongue *Valley of Saints*; wherein is a great Christian minster of the Syrian religion. One hundred and twenty are the poor religious brethren; twenty-five were ordained priests; the rest lived not in ease and leisure, of that which the toiling people have spared, but every man labours with his hands for the common living—the most are husbandmen. Each cheerful sunrising calls them to the fields; where every religious labourer draws apart to be alone with God in his contemplation. The handicraftsmen remain at home, namely the brothers shoemakers, and those who weave the decent black mantles without seam of all the humble [monks]; others serve devoutly in the kitchen, where they bake bread for the convent, and boil their poor victual. The priests remain in the cloister to sing Mass, and say their formal devotion at the canonical hours. At the knelling of the chapel bell those who are in the valley below, at their tillage, pause to bid the church prayers; the convent chapel is a great cave walled-up under the living rock. From sunset to sunset, six times in the natural day, their bells ring out to the common devotion: the brethren rise at the solemn sound in the night season, and assemble to their chapel prayers. The winter months are austere in their airy height of the mountains: the sun, moving behind the pinnacles of that valley-side, shines but an hour upon them.

## 118 C. M. Doughty and a Maronite Monastery

The religious taste no flesh ; bread with oil, and pot-herbs is their common diet ; *léban*\* and eggs they may eat twice in the week. In the deep under them is a little snow-cold river (running from above the Cedars) which turns their millstones : some brothers are millers ; and thereby is a clay building, where, in the spring time, certain of the religious husbandmen feed silkworms.

The cells of the convent are bare walls, with a little open casement, and clay floor twelve feet wide : the cloisterers are poor men, whose senses be but blunt in the use of this world ; and we might think their religious houses little cleanly. Of that society are two hermits, whose dwelling is among the rocks in the dim limestone valley : they pray continually, and a novice carries them down their victual, every midday. There are thirty convents of their order in the mountains of Lebanon ; and amongst the multitude of brethren are, they say, three holy men, unto whom it is given to work miracles. A young [monk], lately ordained priest, whose office was to study, and wait upon any visiting strangers, seeing me suffer from rheumatism in the autumn clouds of these high places, exhorted me, with an affectionate humility, to visit one of the saints, "to whose convent was only five little hours ; and he would ask his abbot's leave to accompany me". One of those men of God healed all manner of infirmities ; another, he told me, had raised even the dead to life ; and of another he said that he had given children many times to barren wives. He knew a sterile woman who visited the man of God ; and she bare a son, according to his saying, before the year's end ; but in the journey, as she carried her babe to him for baptism, the child died. On the third day she came to the saint ; and he restored her dead child to life ! Two men went to visit the saint, and one of them was blind : but as they were in the way the blind man saw ! Then said his companion, "Wherefore should we go further ? What need have we of the man of God ?" But whilst he was speaking, the blindness of the other fell upon him !

No woman may pass their cloister gate. "And is it not", I asked, "a hard thing, that one who is entered into religion should be cut off from marriage ?" "Nay," he answered, "it is an easy thing, it is next to nothing : and I look on a woman as I look on yonder gate-post." This young priest was epileptic, from a child ; and "had been wont", he said, "to fall every day once, till he went to the saint, with whom he abode four months ;

\* *Léban*, Sour milk or curds.

## C. M. Doughty and a Maronite Monastery 119

and the malady left him". He answered that he read only seldom in the Old Testament Scriptures; and asked me, if the Syrian father (and commentator of the Gospels in that tongue), the venerable Ephraim, lived before or were he after Jesus Christ? And whether the Temple, builded by Solomon—with the cedars of Libnân—were before or since Christ's time? Besides, he could not guess what wine had been in the world before the coming of the Messiah, for he thought Jesus first made it by miracle in a marriage supper. Of Noah's sons he had not heard, how many there were, nor their names. But he enquired earnestly of Sinai; and he asked me "in what part of the world lay that holy mountain—at present?"

Finally, he showed me a deep well, in their cloister yard, that he said was "very good for the cure of any who were not in their right minds: and when the patient was drawn up it would be seen that he was come to himself". The poor moon-sick is let down in a dark well, and drenched in water deadly cold! and doubtless the great dread and the chill may work together to knit the fibre of all but the most distempered brains.

The monastery which Doughty visited on this occasion is one dedicated in honour of St. Antony the Great at Kosaya (Qozhayya: "Weariness [or 'Treasure'] of Life"), in the Gubbet-Bsarray province. It is first mentioned in a document of the year 1104; another, dated in 1215, states that it was the see of the first Maronite bishops. It has belonged to the Baladite ("rural", as opposed to Aleppine) congregation of the Maronite Antonians since the year 1708. The present monastery church was built not long before the time that Doughty visited it, and the rest of the buildings were just as he saw them until 1926, when the two upper storeys were rebuilt. Kosaya is a place of pilgrimage to which large crowds resort, and numbers of cures, especially of the insane, are stated to take place at the intercession of St. Antony and others.

The young newly ordained priest with whom Doughty talked has been identified as Father Butros Kaitu, and there are monks now living who knew him in his old age. They are at a loss to understand some of the things that Doughty reports of his conversation. As the venerable Father Martin Tarabey, abbot general of the Baladites,

## 120 C. M. Doughty and a Maronite Monastery

remarks, "It is true that our monks were simple folk in those days, but they were neither simpletons nor crassly ignorant." Moreover, Father Butros is remembered as a man of particular intelligence and talent. It has been suggested that Doughty had an insufficient command of the Lebanese dialect of Arabic. This is hardly tenable; the suggestion that Father Butros was joking with the strange Englishman is a more likely one. In reading *Arabia Deserta* (and some other travel-books, whether classical or not) it is difficult to resist the impression that the author had not been completely inoculated against "having his leg pulled".

For the rest, Doughty's reporting was very exact. But he misunderstood Father Butros's account of the cure of his epilepsy. This was not brought about by the hermit whom he wanted Doughty to see about his rheumatism, but at the tomb of Father Nemattalla Alhardini. He was a monk of Kfifan, who died with a great reputation for holiness in 1858; the cause of his beatification was begun at Rome in 1928, together with those of two more from among the wonder-workers to whom Doughty refers, namely the hermit Father Kharbel of Beka-Kafra and the nun Rifqa al-Rayes. The healing of the blind, of paralytics, and of other apparently hopeless cases was attributed to these three religious, and certain of the cures have already been recognized as authentic by the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

DONALD ATTWATER.

## ART. 10.—BUCHMANISM

What blasphemy! I can say nothing less. And this is what the members of the Movement are fed on. To distort those most sacred words uttered by our Saviour is altogether too terrible. . . . And this is the doctrine of the Oxford Group right up to date. (*The Oxford Group Movement: Is it of God or of Satan?* By J. C. Brown. Pickering & Inglis, 1932, p. 62.)

Not only was I deeply impressed by the wonderful works of God which I there witnessed, but I personally received, as the result of the challenge which was faithfully presented, a heightened vision of what God was able and willing to accomplish through me, did I offer no obstacle of unbelief or self-will to the guidance of His Spirit. (The Anglican Bishop of Calcutta, in *The Times*, September 21, 1933.)

**I**N these two quotations (which are merely representative of many others on each side) we have the expressions of two strongly contrasting general estimates of a very intersnig movement which, originating some twenty years ago, of recent years has been becoming a notable tendency of a "revivalist" kind in many of the English-speaking Protestant Churches. Commonly known as the "Oxford Group Movement", it should be named more accurately "Buchmanism", after its founder. The present article is an attempt at an impartial estimate of it by one who, though of course never participating in it, nevertheless has had opportunities of observing it at first hand.

A brief outline may be given before going into details. As stated above, the term "Oxford Group" is really inaccurate as a name. The movement was started by Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, an American Lutheran pastor, when, in 1909, he commenced work on it in the United States. Dr. Buchman did not visit England until 1920, when he introduced his movement to the undergraduates of Cambridge University, extending it to Oxford in 1921. It should be borne in mind all the time that the view is widely held that the name of Oxford University should not be attached to a movement not only which did not begin there, but with which large numbers of University men and women are out of sympathy.



The primary aim was and is to combat, by what are supposed to be "new methods", that laxity of religious and moral conviction which, it is held, is a characteristic of the present age. The ideal is to begin "a new and higher life by complete surrender to Divine guidance". "Groupers" seek to be "absolutely honest", "absolutely pure", "absolutely unselfish", "absolutely truthful". No enquiries are made as to particular denominational affiliations, or theological beliefs, if any, of adherents. No question is asked as to what Church or school of thought one professes.

We may give a brief description of a Group meeting for men. (Of course, there are also women's and "mixed" meetings.) Such gatherings can be convened in any of a variety of places: church-halls, rooms in hotels or private houses, public halls—in short, in any convenient place. They are of an extremely informal nature. A man who is interested in the Movement will have agreed previously with another man, or other men, to arrange a meeting. A room or hall is engaged and people simply "bring their friends". Chairs are set round in semicircles, or even are scattered without system, and are occupied by the general company, while the convener of the meeting acts as an informal president. As a rule, no formal programme or agenda is followed. The president merely "sets the ball rolling" (this phrase, by the way, is appropriate, for "breezy", and even slangy, colloquialism of speech is popular amongst Groupers, as denoting optimism and *camaraderie*) with some such remark as, "I don't know what is going to happen to-night. Just speak as you feel called."

The meetings generally consist largely of "personal testimony". This is called by Groupers, "sharing". By open public confession of sins and acknowledgment of blessings, each Grouper aims to "share" his experiences with others, to the benefit, it is hoped, of all.

The simplest definition of this form of sharing is "being honest about oneself". To share in this sense is to be willing to acknowledge our mistakes, to admit that we are wrong, to concede our failures, to own up to our sins—in short, to confess. The

ultimate aim of this sharing is a right relationship with God. We are in desperate need of forgiveness; and in the last resort, whatever aids we may use to help us to reach it, we must come to the place where we stand before God face to face, confess to Him our sins, and receive the forgiveness which He so freely gives. There is no other way to fullness of life, and in our hearts we know it. (Rev. J. P. Thornton-Duesbery, Oxford Group pamphlet, *Sharing*, p. 4.)

A man rises and speaks of the sins to which he is or was specially tempted, and how he has broken with them. The most intimate personal details of past sin or temptation are revealed, and that in a mixed assembly, most of the members of which probably are strangers to one another and to the speaker. Some of these "open confessions of sin and surrender" seem amazing. A doctor will confess to having been for years a morphia-addict; an ex-convict will detail his crimes; young men will describe their "sins of the flesh"; details will be given of cheating at cards, dodging bus or rail fares, and other petty swindling; in brief, the open meeting hears personal confessions of sins of all kinds. Roughly, such testimony may be compared with "a confessional without priest, privacy, or systematized theological guidance".

Another striking feature of the movement is what is called the "quiet time", or "silent period". Each Grouper believes himself (or herself) to be guided directly by God, and the custom is to give up a portion (preferably the beginning) of each day for a quiet period of prayer and "passive surrender". It is believed that if this is done the soul will be illuminated with wisdom for the actions of the day. To quote Dr. Buchman himself:

People may be shocked at first by the familiarity with which we speak of our God and our Lord. People very often have been shocked by that talk. They don't understand. You see, we know our God and talk with Him each day. He is guiding us in our enterprise. (*Sunday Chronicle*, London, 1 October, 1933.)

To which a very apposite comment is this, made by an impartial observer in a popular newspaper :

They believe that during a "Quiet Time", when they sit silent with notebook in one hand and pencil in the other, the thoughts that come to them, and which they write down, are divinely inspired messages. To use their own word—"Guidance". For my part I find that a little difficult to accept. To sit relaxed and quiet is an admirable thing. To accept one's subconscious thoughts as the direct voice of God seems to me to be going dangerously far. (H. R. S. Phillpott in the *Daily Herald*, 9 October, 1933.)

This rather characteristically "compromising" journalistic criticism may be supplemented by this of Professor Julian Huxley :

The claim to be the recipient of special divine guidance has occurred over and over again in religious history. It has never proved to be anything but a psychological short-cut to that sense of certitude which is so agreeable, especially to one who has been a prey to doubt or conflict : but which, unless arrived at rationally, not only too often proves merely a temporary palliative to its possessor, but is a source of grave danger, through the intellectual and moral intolerance which it tends to engender, to others. (*The Times*, 27 September, 1933.)

To this criticism Miss Evelyn Underhill replied in the same paper on the next day :

Even those Christians who most deeply distrust revivalistic claims and methods will surely find Professor Julian Huxley an embarrassing ally. In the first place, from our point of view, his doctrine of God seems to be in serious need of attention. In the second place, if the claim to "guidance" be in every case blasphemous and illusory, St. Paul was a blasphemous person and the Book of Acts is a pathological document ; and some of the greatest and most convincing episodes in Christian history—whether Quaker or Catholic—fall under the same condemnation.

There is a certain amount of truth both in Professor Huxley's view and in that of Miss Underhill. Undoubtedly history teems with the delusions of persons

who believed themselves divinely inspired ; but, equally undoubtedly, religion itself would be destroyed if all such inspiration were denied ; and, indeed, the very facts of history itself discredit such denial. As usual, safety is in the middle way. Inspiration is a reality, but not that wholesale, indiscriminate inspiration apparently believed in by the Groupers.

Progress in holiness is a long and painful ascent over a steep path bordered by precipices. To venture thereon without an experienced guide is highly imprudent. It is extremely easy to deceive oneself as regards one's own condition.

Thus an eminent Catholic writer (Very Rev. A. Tanqueray, *The Spiritual Life* ; trans. Branderis, 1930, § 535). This warning may be commended to the Groupers, and may be supplemented colloquially by the "everyday common-sense" view of a writer in a popular weekly (*italics mine*) :

Most of the younger people talked to me quite rationally on most subjects, *save that they all, for their youth, seemed astonishingly well satisfied with themselves.* ("Argus", in the *Empire News*, 8 October, 1933.)

A writer in *The Times* (Mr. F. Bussby, September 21) also says :

Generally speaking, they [Groupers] evince anti-clerical and anti-ecclesiastical tendencies, and are apt to form a new spiritual aristocracy.

In short, this belief in so frequent and so direct a form of divine daily guidance is apt too often to be a sublimation of spiritual pride, and to imply the dangers of that.

Humility [says Tanqueray (op. cit., § 1127)] may be defined as *a supernatural virtue, which, through the self-knowledge it imparts, inclines us to reckon ourselves at our true worth and to seek self-effacement and contempt.* More succinctly, St. Bernard defines it as "a virtue whereby man, through a true knowledge of himself, becomes despicable in his own eyes".

It is to be feared that the virtue of humility is not encouraged by the Group Movement. At first sight, perhaps it may seem that the custom of "sharing"—the "open confession" described above—may tend to humility; but any student of psychology will be aware how likely the very opposite is to be the case. This public enunciation of one's own deeds—even one's own faults—tends to egotism, which is the basis of pride.

We can, then, define pride as *an inordinate love of self, which causes us to consider ourselves, explicitly or implicitly, as our first beginning and last end.* (Tanqueray, § 820.)

We may quote a leading article of *The Times* (27 September, 1933):

And how could evil fail to arise in a movement two of whose chief principles are "sharing" and "guidance"? It would be astonishing if that hawking round of past sins which goes under the name of sharing should not frequently produce spiritual pride in the sharer and besmirch the minds of those with whom they are shared.

As stated above, the Group Movement makes no mention of special religious denominations or particular theological dogmas. That fact seems to place it on a dilemma: If the "guidance" is genuine, it must involve truth: i.e. a definite doctrinal standard; or, if there is no standard, how can there be reliable guidance?

To revert for a moment to the origin of the Movement. As already stated, it was begun in 1909 by Dr. Buchman, an American Lutheran minister. The Movement was confined to the States for a number of years; but in 1920 Dr. Buchman visited England. He himself says:

The story of the growth of the Oxford Group Movement and my own religious mission is a remarkable one. It was while I was training for the ministry that the first of several illuminating religious experiences came to me. I found myself with a consuming passion for converts. I was baffled by my own ineptitude. I wrestled long and continuously with my problem, but the enlightenment I sought was denied me. For a time I worked in

poor churches. I took in to live with me the two young sons of a dipsomaniac. I established a settlement-home something like your own Toynbee Hall. I did whatever work I could find, thinking that in humility and submission lay the way of faith. But soon I found I was deluding myself. As I discovered afterwards, I was undergoing a crisis not of the will but of the emotions. My health broke down under the strain of my work and my incessant wrestling with myself. I was told to take a holiday abroad. It was to Britain that I came to discover my purpose in life and to found the Oxford Group Movement. By chance one day I found my way to Keswick, where a convention was in progress. One afternoon I went to a tiny village church. There was an absurdly small congregation. A woman was preaching. . . . It was in her words that I found revelation. . . . She spoke of the Cross and of intimate acquaintance with the Christ. . . . I became suddenly translated into "oneness" with Christ, and a wave of immense emotion swept through me. . . . So, twelve years ago, following my experience at Keswick, I visited the University of Oxford. I met there a little knot of undergraduates. . . . I told them of my experience. In the rooms of a Christ Church undergraduate we talked and we prayed together. That little band of young men became the first disciples of the Movement. . . . Since then they have wandered with me to the East and to Africa and through all America. . . . To-day the Movement has spread to such an extent that in July last 5000 devout people gathered at what we call a "house party" for more than two weeks. They came from forty different nations. Last week in Geneva the adherents of the Group in the League of Nations held a lunch; 100 of the delegates to the League were there. (*Sunday Chronicle*, 1 October, 1933.)

(It should be mentioned that in 1922 the Rev. Howard J. Rose, an Anglican curate in Sussex, came under the influence of Dr. Buchman and, when appointed a chaplain at Oxford, started a Group for undergraduates—at first on somewhat independent lines, but in 1928 in full association with that of Dr. Buchman. In that year he led a "team"—as Group "apostles", working together, are called—to South Africa, and the rather inaccurate name, "the Oxford Group", seems then to have originated.)

It will be seen that the Buchman Movement really had two beginnings: the earlier attempt in America



in 1909, and the fuller enterprise in England after Dr. Buchman's experience at Keswick.

A leading literary exponent of the Group's aims is the Rev. S. M. Shoemaker, jun., the rector of the Calvary Episcopal Church, New York—who, indeed, has been described as “Dr. Buchman's right-hand man”, and of whose works may be mentioned *Children of the Second Birth*, *Twice-born Ministers*, *The Religion that Works*, *Confident Faith*, and *Realizing Religion*. The famous book, *For Sinners Only*, by A. J. Russell, is a sensational depository of the spiritual experiences of Groupers. To a modified extent the same remark may be applied to a smaller work, *Soul Surgery*, by Howard Walter. The late Mr. Harold Begbie, in a book entitled *Life Changers*, has described some effects of such work.

Now we come to a crucial question. It is almost needless to say that it arises from the fact, already alluded to, that the Group makes no enquiries as to the denominational beliefs of its adherents, and has no doctrinal creed of its own. The obvious question is: How do those facts become consistent with the alleged possession of an evangelical mission?

“I found myself,” says Dr. Buchman, as already quoted, “with a consuming passion for converts.” “In Britain I discovered my purpose in life: to found the Oxford Group Movement.” “I found revelation.” “[The woman preacher who was the means of that revelation] spoke of the Cross and of intimate acquaintance with the Christ.” Resultant of all this has been the Group Movement, spread amongst people “from forty different nations”. Surely so fervent an apostolate should have a clear body of doctrine from which to preach! How can an apostolate aim effectively at a high religious standard if it has no definite code of doctrine? How can we aim at a cloudy target? Will not the result be chaos in the one case or the arrow flying wide in the other?

Dr. Buchman says:

First of all, we accept the doctrines of the Church. We are not a separate denomination. We have no organized body. We

do not keep statistics of membership. We simply believe that we are guided by God. (*Sunday Chronicle*, article already quoted.)

But what a vague phrase—"the doctrines of the Church"! Used by a "Roman Catholic", it is intelligible; but by a Protestant . . . ! Of *which* Church—or Churches? Are Unitarians excluded? If not, the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, the Redemption of Calvary, are not Group essentials. Are Quakers excluded? What is the Group teaching as to sacraments, grace, the nature of sin, and other vital problems of faith? All these matters are subjects of disagreement in "the Church"—understanding by that phrase all the, or even all the leading, Protestant denominations.

The eminent Congregational leader, Principal W. B. Selbie, in a letter to *The Times* of 22 September, 1933, expressed the matter thus :

The two chief dangers which confront the movement at the moment are its lack of intellectual and theological background and its comparative failure to influence and work in with the Christian Churches. No religious movement can live on emotion alone, and the naïve Biblicism which the Groups sometimes encourage seems to suggest a type of theology that is already obsolete.

In the *Church Times* of October 6 "A young Cambridge undergraduate", in an article on "The Group Movement", said that "Dr. Buchman ignores the Church's teaching, and substitutes his own, calling it primitive Christianity of the first century".

At a Group meeting at which—as an onlooker desiring information, but taking no personal part in the proceedings—I was present, the lack of a doctrinal standard not only was obvious, but was emphasized. Stress was laid on the fact that denominational affiliations are immaterial. Amongst those taking part in the "testimony" were High Church Anglicans, decided Low Church Protestants, persons of no denominational allegiance, a Spiritualist, and one gentleman who stated to me that he did not believe that Jesus Christ ever

lived, but that nevertheless we should follow Christ's guidance in the sense of constituting that mythical figure a spiritual ideal for our conduct. Yet all these people of such differing beliefs were equally Groupers.

Indeed, as already mentioned, this eclecticism is made by Groupers a matter of merit for the Movement. To quote one such writer (Mr. Evan Spicer, in *The Times*, 25 September, 1933):

Our aim is to win men and women to Jesus Christ, not half-heartedly, but definitely, and to follow Him as He would have us. The Group is composed of almost every class of people—High Churchmen, Low Churchmen, Free Churchmen, and men who have been atheists, men who have had very extreme views—in fact, one can hardly make an exception of those who have not been brought under the influence of the Spirit of Jesus Christ. (Mr. Evan Spicer, in *The Times*, 25 September, 1933.)

Of course, it is easy to understand such an ideal if meaning that effort must be made to convert people of all sorts to truth. St. Paul the Apostle said :

Factus sum infirmis infirmus, ut infirmos lucrificarem ; omnibus omnia factus sum, ut omnes facerem salvos. (*Epistola ad Corinthios Prima*, cap. ix, 22.)

St. Paul, however, "became all things to all men" in order to convert them to a definite doctrine ; not merely in order to inspire them with cloudy ideals.

Is it, however, *certain* that it is just to condemn the Group as a mere vehicle of emotional ideality devoid of coherent doctrinal standards ? Such a conclusion needs to be reached only if no other is possible. Let us seek for a possibly more desirable one if such can be found.

On 6 July, 1933, the great Free Church paper, *The British Weekly*, issued a special eight-paged "Oxford Group Supplement", which I believe has been circulated since then by thousands in separate form. It carried articles by eminent writers in explanation of the Group. Amongst those writers are Canon L. W. Grensted, Oriel Professor of Philosophy of the Christian Religion at Oxford ; the Rev. J. P. Thornton Duesbery ; Sir

Lynden Macassey ; Bishop Carey of Bloemfontein ; Dr. J. H. Linton, Anglican Bishop in Persia ; Dr. C. F. Andrews ; etc. We may seek here, then, for some definite standards of belief.

The "Supplement Editor", in his Foreword, expressed the Group ideals thus :

Stop! No more platitudes. It is so easy to confess other people's failings. Turn right round and start again. Begin inside yourself. Live a life of purity, honesty, unselfishness and love. Listen to God for His Guidance. Pray, "Thy will be done." Have faith and rely upon God. This is His world, not ours. Share your experiences, your victories and defeats, with God and your friends. Listen to God's word and act upon it. That is the message of the Oxford Groups. The old message presented with a new force. It is life-changing. The vision, once caught, is never lost. The people of the world can be changed, *are* being changed the only possible way, individually, one by one.

In an article entitled "The Alternatives", the Rev. James Reid said :

Some people have objected that in the principles of this movement there is nothing new. That is perfectly true. It is the old, old truth that if we are absolutely honest with ourselves and with God, and are ready to surrender to His will at the points where He claims obedience, His Spirit will come in to possess and guide and use our lives.

The Rev. J. P. Thornton Duesbery (article, "A Don's Experience") said :

All sorts of vistas open out : God's Will being looked for first in choice of job or career ; masters' meetings and gatherings and governing bodies seeking in a quiet time the solution of their multifarious moral, social, and economic problems ; and then, as youth grows up and goes out into the world, the same spirit and practice informing local and national politics, and so on to a world conference itself.

The Rev. Alan Thornhill (article, "Uncompromising Christians") said :

It was the startling change in the life of a friend, after he had attended a house-party, that brought me to a standstill. I had thought to grow gradually into an effective life. Now I knew that some drastic pruning was needed before I could grow at all.

Sir L. Macassey (article, "A Strange Dynamic Force") described the Group as "the infusion of the spirit of adventure into religion". Mr. Norman Price, advocate of the Supreme Court of South Africa (article, "Whole Country Permeated"), said :

There can be no doubt that the whole country [South Africa] is now permeated and honeycombed with a living and vital Christianity, such as has never been imagined in South Africa.

The Rev. C. F. Andrews (article, "The Impossible Accomplished") said :

If the whole religious atmosphere of South Africa is different to-day and full of promise, it is due in God's good providence very greatly to the Oxford Groups. May He, the Lord and Giver of Life, complete the great change which has been so wonderfully begun !

In a long article on "What I Have Found in the Groups", Dr. Linton, Anglican Bishop in Persia, said :

It was a whole Gospel : the Incarnation, the Cross, the Risen, living Christ energizing the world, changing lives to-day.

Dr. D. A. Davis (note, "Another Opinion" ; Dr. Davis is a member of the World's Committee of the Young Men's Christian Association at Geneva) said :

Where the Groups have been in Europe, drifting, useless, often harmful lives have been redirected and given purpose ; discouraged, despairing, and cynical people have been filled with hope, joy, and confidence.

Certainly there seems, in all this, something worthy of notice ; but what is it ? The only allusion to any definite doctrinal standard is in Bishop Linton's statement, that the Group's basis is "a whole Gospel"—

Incarnation, Cross, and Risen, living Christ ; but that is far from correct. The Groups welcome anyone, and no questions are asked as to doctrinal creed. A Unitarian would be as welcome as a Trinitarian. Indeed, one critic of the Groups (J. C. Brown, *The Oxford Group Movement : Is it of God or of Satan ?*) says (p. 13) :

In all that he [Dr. Buchman] has ever written or spoken that I have come across, or heard of, there is a complete absence of "ruin by the Fall" and "redemption through the Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ". Even a prominent leader in the Movement, who had worked in close co-operation with him for years, confessed to me in the course of a conversation that Dr. Buchman was not preaching the atonement, and that he had never heard him once mention the Blood of Christ !

Mr. Brown is a critic definitely opposed to the Movement ; but, allowing for his bias, there can be little doubt that he is right. The Group welcomes anyone ; no questions are asked as to doctrine ; an extreme High Churchman (indeed, even a "Roman Catholic", so far as the Group itself is concerned) would be welcome, but so would an old-fashioned "down-with-priests" Protestant, a Quaker, a Salvationist, a Unitarian. Indeed, as related above, I myself have spoken to a Grouper who believed in Christ only as an ideal figure, not as an historical person. This very eclecticism, in fact, itself explains why Dr. Linton got the impression that a "whole Gospel" is taught. He came into contact with those who were orthodox. As for the rest of the quotations from the *Supplement*, it will be seen that not one of them contains any doctrinal statement. They consist exclusively of testimonies to the awakening of zeal ; but no statement is made as to what were the beliefs of the people who have been awakened. Possibly in a majority of cases such people have been of some form of more or less orthodox Protestant belief ; but by no means is that a *sine qua non*. Into theological beliefs enquiry is not made.

The truth is that the Group Movement is simply "an effort at stirring up", the people stirred up not being asked to conform to any doctrinal code enunciated



by the Groups, but simply to be honest, truthful, pure, and loving ; while, as to theology, they are recommended to keep to the religious denomination (if any) to which already they may belong. This fact, that the Groups are really mere "stirrers-up", is evidenced even by their deportment and characteristic phraseology. They cultivate a breezy optimism, a smiling heartiness, and a colloquialism of speech often verging on slanginess. In a spiritual sense they go about saying, "Now then, old chap, shake a leg ! Wake up ! Don't hang about ! Get a move on ! Why waste time ? Follow the gleam !" This is by no means a *bad* effort ! People need arousing. But why allude to "a whole Gospel" ? The Group teaches no Gospel but that of "following the gleam". The Gospel which its adherents individually follow is that in which each one always believed—or to which he or she has returned after lapse. So far as the Groups have awakened people from lethargy, good ; but, really, that is the whole of its task. As regards doctrine, it has no code at all beyond "be honest, truthful, pure, and loving". That is good ; but it leaves the theological and philosophical basis undefined.

This fact has a distinct bearing on the Group's custom of "sharing"—open public confession of sins and testimonies to changes for the better. To a Catholic that custom will seem a sign of the instinctive need of such an institution as the confessional ; but there is no need here to touch on that aspect of the matter, except to remark that "sharing" lacks the privacy, the discipline, the priestly sanction, and the doctrinal basis of the confessional.

The Rev. J. P. Thornton-Duesbery, in his Oxford Group booklet on *Sharing*, from which a quotation has been made above, says (pp. 4-5) :

Theoretically, there is not the smallest reason why a sinner should not confess his sins direct to God and receive, and know that he is receiving, God's forgiveness then and there ; obviously, in fact, this has happened and happens time and again. But in practical experience, and just because we are not ideal, instance after instance could be quoted to show that there are very many

who need the help of sharing with one another, in order that they may come directly face to face with God. . . . From its earliest days (James v, 16 ; Acts xix, 18) the Christian Church has been well aware of the value of such confession. Wesley and the modern Anglo-Catholic are at one in this. In one sense the psycho-analyst, with his splendid technique based upon exhaustive experiment, is simply bringing scientific verification to what the Church learnt long ago under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, though she has often forgotten to practise the lesson.

On the other hand, the Rev. C. M. Chavasse, Master of St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, said in the Anglican Evangelical paper, *The Record*, 18 November, 1932 :

*As regards sharing in public to obtain release from sin* [italics Dr. Chavasse's]—the whole experience of the Church for nearly two thousand years is against it. A sense of release by unburdening conscience can as effectually be obtained by sharing in private with some discreet healer of souls ; and in this manner, also, a sense of divine forgiveness can be instilled, which rarely seems to result from Group sharing. Moreover, the crude and rigid system of the Group takes no account of individual temperament.

These two opposed views are interesting for comparison. The present article is not a scientific estimate of Groupism from the standpoint of a professional Catholic theologian ; for the simple reason—if for no others—that I am not such a theologian, but write simply as a lay student and observer. Therefore (as already stated), I do not discuss the Group's "sharing" from the viewpoint of comparing it with the Catholic confessional. That comparison "springs to the eye", and there is no need for me to go into it. I confine myself to a humbler criticism : namely that of ordinary prudence and moral experience ; and from that point of view I have no doubt that Dr. Chavasse is right in condemning the "sharing". When Dr. Thornton-Duesbery says that "there are very many who need the help of sharing with another", what point has such a remark as justifying meetings where all sorts of sins are "blared forth" in public before a miscellaneous assembly of

mostly (or all) strangers? It is not *that* which "the Church learnt long ago under the guidance of the Holy Spirit". Dr. Chavasse is quite right in his remark (which might have been a direct reply to Dr. Thornton Duesbery; but it was written earlier) that "a sense of release by unburdening conscience can as effectually be obtained by sharing in private with some discreet healer of souls". Without carrying the discussion on to the subject of the Catholic confessional, we can conclude without hesitation that the Group "sharing" (though it is needless to deny that incidental good may have come of it; incidental good comes of most things!) is fundamentally wrong. It rests on no doctrinal basis; it has no authorized guide of the sharers; it encourages egotism; it leads to excess of emotional feeling; it must arouse morbid curiosity in many cases; and its lack of privacy is (in the etymological sense of the word at least; possibly, alas, often even in the colloquial sense) indecent. At a meeting at which I myself was an on-looker, men spoke openly of how they used to cheat the buses and trams, get drunk, and have immoral relations with women, but had relinquished such acts since coming under the influence of the Group. I really could not see how anyone was the better from making or hearing public speeches of that nature. It is difficult to suppose anyone was the better for it. However, it is necessary to be scrupulously fair, so it must be added that perhaps I was listening with a certain degree of adverse bias; and as I was not myself a participant, so perhaps I did not understand fully the motives, ideals, and feelings of the speakers. After allowing fully for all this, however, it must be admitted that "sharing" is one of the most questionable features of Groupism. The Bishop of Rochester, Dr. M. Linton Smith, alluded to it thus while addressing his Diocesan Conference on November 2:

There can be no question whatever in the mind of any dispassionate observer that the Group movement has radically changed many people's lives for the better. There is, of course, the danger that such a movement may form itself into a new sect.

My own belief is that, if the Church takes a sympathetic attitude towards the movement, that movement will permeate the Church with its good effects and so enrich its life. The methods of the movement have come in for serious criticism, and the cruder forms unquestionably deserve it. The practice of "sharing" in the sense of public confession of sin has very obvious dangers, but one of the best-known leaders of the movement assured me that they are doing their best to prevent this and to insist that the "sharing" in this sense shall take place in private. (London *Evening Standard*, 2 November, 1933.)

What, then (to bring this article to a conclusion), must be our estimate of Buchmanism? Of course, from a Catholic point of view it is but one more development of religious aspiration outside the One True Church; but this article does not attempt the task—which pertains rather to the professed theological expert—of estimating the movement in that respect, as contrasted with or related to Catholic theology. The humbler effort of this article is to look at Buchmanism in its own environment, and to calculate, in that relationship, the possible balance of its good and bad factors.

On 7 October, 1933, a special service was held in St. Paul's Cathedral, at which the Bishop of London gave his "commission" to a "team" of five hundred men and women to conduct a campaign for "life-changing" on the lines of Buchmanism. Amongst those present were the Bishop of Croydon, Commander Sir Walter Windham, Sir Evan Spicer, Lady Fletcher, Baroness Albertine van Beecheren van Kell (Lady-in-Waiting to the Queen of the Netherlands), Vice-Admiral Sidney Drury-Lowe, Mr. Cuthbert M. Cox (headmaster of Berkhamsted School), and others. The team of Groupers occupied a reserved place in the Cathedral, and were welcomed by the Bishop. Dean Inge read the Lesson, and Dr. Fosse-Westcott, Bishop of Calcutta (whose testimony to the Group is quoted at the beginning of this article) gave an address. After the prayers, and as the congregation sang the hymn, "Praise, my soul, the King of Heaven", the Bishop of London came to the chancel step. As he stood there, Dr. Buchman advanced and

asked the Bishop's blessing "upon those who go forth in the name of Christ, that they may rejoice in the power of the Holy Spirit". The Bishop replied: "Go forth, my brothers; go forth in the faith of Him who is able to do exceeding abundantly, above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us." (It may be mentioned that, for many months before this "commissioning" by the Bishop of London, the Group Movement had been welcomed enthusiastically by the Methodists; with which denomination, in fact, it seems most akin.)

The Group movement, therefore, has now passed from its initial stage of "free-lance revivalism", and has become a recognized ally of the two most considerable English-speaking non-Catholic Churches. Probably the result will be that it will shed its more pronounced crudities and become mainly an influence for increasing zeal and devotion within those denominations. It is unlikely in itself to be a permanent or even very long-lived movement; but, on balance, eventually will be found, probably, to have accomplished, within its own special environment, a valuable amount of good in arousing people from laxity, and in many cases also from grave sin, and directing their thoughts to higher things.

This estimate of Buchmanism, of course, expresses simply the view of the writer of this article, who puts it forward merely as that of a lay student and conscientious, impartial observer.

J. WM. POYNTER.

## QUARTERLY REFLECTIONS

MAN, WORK, Publishers, being unable to gauge with SOCIETY any accuracy the public's taste in seven-and-sixpences, publish on the "hit or miss" principle. Ten thousand books are published in this country every year. What with the "misses" and the efforts of smaller publishers, we can still, in an age of literary stunts, find books that are really worth paying for. True, we have had to go rather far afield to find some of them. The first, *La Famille*, by the Abbé Leclercq, is published by Wesmael-Charlier of Namur. The second is hardly a book at all, but the July number of a French review, called *Esprit*. The third, *The End of Our Time*, by Berdiaeff (Sheed and Ward), is a translation from the Russian through the French. The fourth is a sixpenny pamphlet by Lord Howard of Penrith, published by Burns and Oates. The last, at least, is an honest British best-seller, *The Shape of Things to Come*, by Wells (Hutchinson), and it is included because it will exercise the reader's mind in much the same way as coarse vegetable food helps the digestion of more nourishing substances.

Karl Marx, with his facile generalization that all history is determined by the problem of bread-and-butter, enslaved his own mind and those of nearly all his contemporaries. It never occurred to him to ask whether history *ought* to be a matter of bread-and-butter. On the contrary, he followed the line of least resistance and searched for an earthly paradise in which bread-and-butter alone would satisfy the heart of man. The very natural result is that, despite the fine liberal and individualistic ideals of the democratic humanism of the last century, we have now lost all interest in the individual as such. His taste for bread-and-butter is altogether too dull. Instead of interesting ourselves in the true economic problem, the importance of which was certainly emphasized by Marx, the problem, that is, of how to secure for the individual the chance of a decent economic life, we convert economics into an abstract political and religious philosophy transcending in its



majesty the problem of the individual altogether. Until we see economics from the angle of the individual again, the individual with his spiritual as well as temporal needs, we shall be unable to resist enslavement by Marx. M. Jean Plaquevent, in a remarkable article in *Esprit* entitled "De Quelques Aventures de la Notion du Travail", shows us how to do this. He traces the different conceptions of work or labour that have been held at various periods of the development of Western civilization. From the point of view of the individual, economics is a question of working and being rewarded for work according to some system, and working, as soon as it is analysed, is seen to involve something much wider than mere economic considerations. Why should man work? Is man contemplative or active? Is it natural that he should work? Is work a punishment? Is it a pleasure? What different meanings does the term cover? (M. Plaquevent shows well how the etymology of the words for it in various languages cover the great variety of meanings.) What is the relation between labour or "work done", as used by the economists and physicists, and *human* work? Here is a realistic and moral approach to the gravest problems of the present day. Man, work, society—that is the order. The writer has little patience with the cut-and-dried sociological and economic treatises of the neo-scholastics, for they are compromises between incompatibilities, between Catholic principles and a totally false approach to the question of man and society. He would rather go back to the writings of Augustine and Chrysostom, and from them pass straight to the Encyclicals of Leo XIII, and thus, by restoring the Christian idea of the dignity and yet suffering of human labour, challenge the economic world and not a few Catholics as well.

**THE FAMILY** But before man is a worker, he is a member of the family, though his conduct as a family man will largely depend on his status as a worker. State, political parties, reformers, economists, they are

all attacking the unity of man-in-the-family, for the family is the most obvious sign of man's spiritual independence, of his right to think for himself and organize the principles of his own life. And Catholics have not been slow in defending the integrity of the family. But too many of these apologists have failed to study the problem as it really presents itself, the problem of the Christian family set in the modern State and part and parcel of modern society. In this country, at all events, there is no intelligent, up-to-date, and understanding book that keeps the vital problems of the time in the forefront of the discussion. The Abbé Leclercq has provided those who read French with such a book. It should be translated without delay. The great merit of the work lies in the author's appreciation of the moral quality of many who attack the Christian idea of sex. It is not the evil, but the unintelligent and puzzled goodness of our non-Christian contemporaries which we have to understand and overcome. We have to show them the self-contradiction involved in their own honest efforts both in morals and economics.

**TWO PROPHETS** It is this fundamental self-contradiction, this "self-negation and self-destruction by the way of self-definition and self-affirmation", in the humanist movement, which M. Berdiaeff exposes. At first sight, the reader of *The End of Our Time* may come to the conclusion that Berdiaeff would not accept the statement made above about the goodness in non-Christianity, for this uncompromising thinker believes that the world is set for the fight between Christ and Antichrist. But Berdiaeff's Antichrist, though seen with the eyes of one who has experienced and understood the Russian Revolution, lurks behind stupidity and the evil that comes from being too stupid. Stupidity cannot see the Truth, and since it, like everything else, must be attracted by something, it is attracted by falsity, the falsity that in the long run turns into evil. Without any doubt Berdiaeff is one of the most important thinkers of the present time, and if only every one of Mr. Wells's

thousands of readers could be induced to undergo the purgation of Berdiaeff, they would have had the benefit of a splendid treatment for spiritual health. The first thing they would learn is that the imaginative modernist Wells is a reactionary, and that the mystical mediaevalist Berdiaeff is a revolutionary, for, as the latter truly says :

We must look on as reactionary any return to those modern principles which were definitely in the ascendant in nineteenth-century society and which we now see to have failed. . . . The old worn-out world to which we can never go back is precisely the world of modern history ; a world of unbridled and endless covetousness in its public life, of atheism and supreme disdain for the soul, and, at last, of Socialism, the end and crown of all contemporary history. We gladly echo the words of the revolutionary song, "Down with the old world !" but we understand by that term this doomed world of modern times.

Wells is a typical product of this dying Renaissance world. It is true that the *simpliste* optimism of his younger days has been severely shaken. The age which Berdiaeff denounces Wells calls "The Age of Frustration". But this is an accident which cannot touch his fundamental conviction that science and rationalism *can* produce an earthly paradise. Not this year, nor during the next hundred years, but in a hundred and fifty. A convenient war and still more convenient plague that will destroy half mankind are going to rid us of what remains of nationalism, money-grabbing, religion, Christian morals, jealousies, pornography, wars ; and then, by virtue of "Air" communications, "Air" control, and "Air" dictatorship, the World State will for a period impose itself on mankind, to be in its turn superseded by the automatic Stateless self-control of natural goodness :

No need to govern the world. We have made war impossible ; we have liberated ourselves from the great anti-social traditions that set man against man ; we have made the servitude of man to man impossible. The faculties of health, education, and behaviour will sustain the good conduct of the race. The controls of food, housing, transport, clothing, supply, initiative, design, research can do their own work. There is nothing left for a supreme government to do. Except look up the world it has made and see that it is good. And bless it.

Wells has to have recourse to a plague in order to secure a new start. Berdiaeff sees the plague, a spiritual plague, that is already with us. It is the plague that comes from realizing that none of the promises of the humanist Renaissance have been fulfilled. Man sought to build up a better man, a better body, a better intellect, a better soul, but, as he laboured, his creation, in spite of his efforts, took on the form of a soulless automaton with a heart of machinery. The creator in disgust threw his creation on one side and busied himself with grandiose political and social schemes, democratic, socialistic, anarchistic, fascist, which, having bewitched the automata, would make them submissively accept their own impotence. For Berdiaeff the vices of mankind to-day are the inevitable outcome of the lack of "innerness", the lack of a spiritual ideal, the lack of God, and in the very completeness of the collapse of the Renaissance he sees a new hope, the promise of a new Middle Age, during whose darkness the spiritual forces of mankind will rebuild a Christian humanism, the product of that ideal of freedom which was the one spiritual achievement of the humanist Renaissance and the real inner faith which springs not from the Christianity of Constantine, but from the Christianity of the catacombs and of Augustine. For Wells, such persistent clinging to the supernatural is the real impediment in the way of Progress. It will disappear with the disappearance of the money and property which supports it. He literally only sees skin-deep, as deep as biology goes: "the continual automatic struggle of the thing achieved, to hold the new, the new-born individual, the new-born idea, in thrall". And the very adjective "exterior" by which Berdiaeff qualifies with disgust the spirit of the Renaissance is used by Wells to explain how mankind shall improve: "The family ceased to be a vehicle of tradition for the simple reason that these functions were now discharged with far more emphasis, if with less intensity, by *exterior agencies*." Wells, like Berdiaeff, has lost his hope in man as an individual, but somehow these exterior agencies, the workings of man's collective brain by means of "controls", "assimilation", "social nucleation", collected

statistics, communications, will take the place of the efforts of puny man.

"The world is various enough without artificial variety," says Wells. "We are faced with complete nothingness. If there is nothing towards which man can lift up his eyes, he is deprived of substance," answers Berdiaeff. Simplify man out of existence and one day he will return to the terrestrial paradise prepared for him by the experts, is Wells' gospel. Berdiaeff happens to know that man is a spiritual creature. He cannot be simplified, but if he is not governed by his soul, his faculties will lose their coherence, their order, and the devil within him, that other side of his spiritual self, will govern him and the society of which he is a member.

**THE PREVENTION OF WAR** Neither of these two prophets, bent as they are on striking at the roots of our troubles, has much to say about the immediate concern which fills the Press with scare articles: the danger of war. When Germany walked out of the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations, it certainly seemed as though the creaking machinery set up since the war to keep nations in order was about to collapse completely. Germany was largely justified, not because the League of Nations had failed the nations, but because the nations had failed the League. As Berdiaeff so rightly suggests, political and international institutions are a secondary consideration. To be effective they must be ontologically based, based on "the essence of will". So long as nations have not the will to avoid the causes of war, no League of Nations can possibly help, nor can any treaties or pacts. Nevertheless among the many suggestions for a formal way of preventing war that have been put forward, the proposal contained in Lord Howard of Penrith's pamphlet *The Prevention of War by Collective Action*, written, it seems, in order to counter the views of the Nazi professor Ewald Banse, is the most sensible. It is based on a financial and economic boycott of a nation or nations that show themselves to be the aggressors by refusing

"to agree to an armistice pending investigation of the causes of the dispute". The boycott would be put into effect automatically by the signatories of the Kellogg Pact because all signatories of the Pact cease to be neutrals towards any aggressor by the very terms of the Pact. The clumsy and slow methods of the League would be unnecessary. But would not the temptation to break the boycott in order to obtain great and immediate wealth be altogether too strong to be resisted by nations governed by the kind of men and the quality of ideas so sternly analysed by Berdiaeff ? All historical precedent goes to show that economic boycott has two effects ; it offers irresistible temptations both to nations and to individuals, and these in their turn lead to a new source of quarrels among nations. It has, of course, never been organized on the scale contemplated by Lord Howard, but it is the possibility of that organization that one questions. It is, at least, consoling to learn that Germany has now disavowed the notorious teaching of Professor Banse on the magnificence and beauty of the war spirit, though it has not relieved him of his State-paid duties as an official lecturer appointed by the Nazis.

M.d.l.B.



## SCME RECENT BOOKS

LAFAYETTE: A REVOLUTIONARY GENTLEMAN. By  
Michael de la Bédoyère. (Cape, 15s.)

It is an irony of history that Lafayette, to whom such fame came so soon in life, to stay for so long, has suffered adventitious eclipse ever since. Nothing that he wrote about himself, or that others wrote about him, made him live; and although the nineteenth century in America and Europe subscribed so generally to his creed, he remained a name, a correct pasteboard figure like the actors in toy theatres who cannot be apprehended in the round, because, alas, they are but surfaces. Perhaps it was the very rightness of his creed, in the eyes of his successors, that made him seem dull, and earned for him a hurried lip-service, while the imagination fed not on Lafayette or Washington, but on Napoleon and Robespierre and Nelson, the men of obvious and decisive action. At any rate, Lafayette has found his biographer at last. The recent renewed interest in biography has shown an increasing favour to serious biography as the best way of making history palatable to digestions nourished on fiction. The last ten years have seen many biographies, of varying excellence and demerit, and among them the life of Lafayette by Count de la Bédoyère must be accorded a very high place. Within the limits of three hundred pages it tells everything without giving any sense of compression or haste. It threads its path through the French Revolution without any polite and convenient assumptions of detailed knowledge of events on the part of the reader. It is eminently fair, but the author has that amount of sympathy with Lafayette which gives warmth and momentum to his book. He thinks Lafayette is underrated, and proves his case by a steady unfolding of what Lafayette did. The book is interpretative and does not shrink from diagnosis and verdict in discussing the politics pursued by its protagonists, notably between 1789-93. Lafayette might and probably will encounter hostile biography, for which he has provided plenty of ammunition by his self-conscious rectitude of purpose, but Count

de la Bédoyère is content to find his humour on the side, in the seasickness of his hero or in his solemnity about his value, and to respect his driving convictions and purpose as they deserve. It is a remarkable story that results. Lafayette was lucky in his fortune and fame as a young man, but his connexion with the successful American revolution, which made his position in France, came from his own ardour in the first place. His position between '89 and '91, as head of the National Guard, proved repeatedly to be a key position, and Lafayette used his great powers well, if not greatly. Like the Abbé Sieyès, he was abler than he now appears, because a devotion to parliamentary rights and paper constitutions makes a man look stiff and obstinate and in a world of his own, and is always faintly irritating. The weakness of vanity led him to claim more credit than he was entitled to for the victories against the British in America. As Count de la Bédoyère well says: "The truth provides fame enough for a great man; the embellishments alone provide the ground for the judgment that he was not as great as he appeared to be."

The overshadowing of his talents by his political decisions is particularly marked at the time of the fall of the French Monarchy. He was commander of an army in 1792, and was in as strong a position as any other public man to control events. But he would not march against the Convention or fight its battles. He laid down his command and went into exile that soon became and remained rigorous imprisonment—for his Austrian captors believed him to be one of the chief causes of the French Monarchy's fall. After that, he was unpopular with both sides. Royalist detestation of him was so extreme that Napoleon, when he came, unenthusiastically, to treat for his release, was much impressed. Lafayette would never serve the Emperor, but he emerged during the Hundred Days and took a large part in forcing the Second Abdication. In consequence Napoleon was not generous or just to his name when it arose in conversation at St. Helena. Lafayette again played a great part in the revolution of 1830, and it really rested with him whether a Republic should be declared, or the Orleans Monarchy. He was soon

disillusioned about Louis-Philippe, but he received no further opportunities for acting as king-maker.

In recording and appraising such a career, Count de la Bédoyère has enabled English-readers, still influenced by Carlyle's uncomprehending portrait, to appreciate the man behind the name of Lafayette. In a second edition it would be an act of justice to amend the note referring to Mr. Belloc's appraisal of Lafayette in *The Last Days of the French Monarchy*, where reference is made to his erroneous belief that Lafayette was Commander-in-Chief in 1792. Mr. Belloc merely points out that Lafayette was the chief of the three commanders of the three French armies, of the North, the Centre, and the Rhine, as he undoubtedly was in standing and influence. It was against this army that the spearhead of the invasion was coming, and his rôle was greater than that of one among three: he was the one who mattered most. On p. 196, 1794 is printed for 1795. Of this pedantic order are the faults which can be found in a study at once full and deep and balanced, which is yet written with a freedom from mannerism and an easy narrative style which carries crystal-clear summaries in single sentences, as this of Mirabeau: "He bestrode the centre with one foot among the counter-revolutionaries and the other among the Jacobins, ready as circumstances should prompt to bring the right foot up to the left or the left foot up to right. Lafayette sat blinking hopefully between his giant legs." A sound and brilliant book.

DOUGLAS WOODRUFF.

THE CELTIC PEOPLES AND RENAISSANCE EUROPE. By David Mathew. (Sheed and Ward, 18s.)

WITH this one book Father David Mathew has by general consent placed himself immediately among the foremost of our English Catholic writers and historical interpreters, an achievement which his subsequent smaller writings have fully consolidated. He combines qualities almost paradoxical in their concurrence. Fine scholarship and knowledge are presented with a rare literary delicacy; intensity of feeling goes hand in glove with wide sympathies and a solid quality of imperturbability; breadth

of vision is allied with a true understanding of the narrow character of the motives that determine most human action. The book is formed of twenty-two essays, each a thematic and artistic whole, the unifying purpose of which is, in the author's own words: "The study of the change in the structure of life in Britain [during the Elizabethan period] and the political influence of the Celtic fringes upon the New England." The line of approach is cultural and social. The struggles of the politically incoherent, yet culturally not unattractive—if somewhat ingenuous—civilizations of Ireland, Wales, and the Scotch Highlands against the power of the Tudor government, and in precarious alliance with the purely English elements of opposition to Elizabeth and Burleigh, are traced in vividly drawn detail, and brought to a head in the Essex rebellion at the close of the century. Parallel treatment of the Celtic elements in the counter-Reformation goes towards justifying the rather over-wide title of the book. Father Mathew shows with great perception and insight what uneasy and indeed unfruitful bed-fellows were English and Welsh, Spanish and Irish, within the counter-reform. Once again we learn the old truth that a divergence of culture may be in practice too much for common action based solely on the demands of a common Catholicity.

Vivid and penetrating though the Celtic aspect of Father Mathew's studies may be, they hardly constitute the main value of his book. It is in the analysis of the strength of the Elizabethan Settlement that its chief contribution to historical understanding lies. It must be long since so fresh, so convincing, so truly illuminating a study of that settlement has appeared. The secret of its power, of the final victory of Elizabeth and Cecil and Parker, was the successful appeal to the real objects of Englishmen's loyalties; the astute alliance, with the new religion and with each other, of two dominating, if seemingly opposed, factors in national life: on the one hand the worship of the new Renaissance kingship and statercraft; on the other, all the body of traditional, deeply rooted local loyalties and interests and pursuits, centring round hearth, soil, family, parish,

county, which have played so fundamental a part in English history. These factors were enlisted on the side of the Prayer Book and the anti-papal "claque", the one by the device of the Royal Supremacy, the other by the external continuity of church organization—so deeply and inextricably interwoven with the very fibre of English social life—achieved in 1559-1560. Against forces so immediately compelling, so eminently practical because ordinary, in their appeal, the traditional feeling for the Mass, let alone the already moribund and long-sapped loyalty to the Pope, were in the end powerless—and the Marian Catholic squires begot the Anglican Cavaliers of the Civil War. Father Mathew illustrates this very convincingly in pages that are suffused with a kind of wistful pathos. Taking particular examples in families and groups of families in different parts of the country, he shows the strength and direction of those social forces to which priest and squire most quickly responded, and which, combined with lack of Catholic leadership and with general uncertainty of the event, drove the bulk of them into conformity. The landslide of the seventies, though accelerated by certain particular events, was in the main but the logical result of the slow undermining of the sixties. In the passivity of the great majority of the Marian squires and clergy, and in the very great community of social feeling and interests which existed between those who conformed and those who did not, Father Mathew rightly sees the roots of the secular position in the later controversies over the Spanish Succession and the Oath of Allegiance.

Father Mathew possesses in a high degree the power of conjuring up a vivid picture in a few words. Some of his Hebridean and Irish scenes are almost perfectly drawn, and his accounts of the activities of pirates, of gun-running, and of the difficult business of landing priests from the Continent are of remarkable freshness and skill. Any suspicion that the author's own powers of sympathetic reconstruction may have been allowed to blossom a little independently are set at rest by the assurance that every detail is founded upon documentary evidence. Father Mathew's work on private papers has been wide

and thorough and fruitful, and constant reference to scenery and the details of moral and social life is a necessary part of his method, as well as engaging element in his technique. None the less, he is an artist as well as an historian, and he has thrown an artist's delicacy of perception, and an artist's intensity of vision, around instincts and forces that were probably viewed in far more humdrum fashion by the generality of our coarser-grained Elizabethan ancestors.

H. O. Evennett.

**THE USE OF POETRY AND THE USE OF CRITICISM :** Studies in the Relation of Criticism to Poetry in England.  
By T. S. Eliot. (Faber, 1933, 7s. 6d.)

IN the autumn of 1932 Mr. Eliot went to America. In the course of the following winter he delivered at Harvard eight lectures. Then, last spring, he gave a further series of lectures at the University of Virginia. This book contains the lectures he gave at Harvard. According to the dedication and the preface, he is not entirely pleased with them. He speaks in the preface of committing "another unnecessary book" solely because it was a condition of their being given orally that they should afterwards be published. That can only apply, however, to their appearance in America.

One would of course like to protest that his misgivings are unwarranted. Unfortunately, that is not with honesty altogether possible. In these lectures Mr. Eliot's prose, which has found so many admirers, retains its quality; needless to say, he has not failed to raise a number of questions that are certainly exciting and may be important, and he makes many passing remarks worth noting; but what he apparently sets out to do he does not, I feel, achieve.

He would have it that criticism operates between two theoretical limits, "at one of which we attempt to answer the question 'what is poetry?' and at the other 'is this a good poem?'" Accepting this, I do not believe that anyone can discover from these lectures what Mr. Eliot understands by poetry or why he considers any



particular poem to be good. On the whole, it is towards the former of his limits that he tends, and this seems a pity, for I incline to think that his real virtue as a critic lies in his ability to appraise both the parts and the whole of individual poems. As a theorist, he is apt to wander.

One instance is where he seeks to illuminate the problem of poetry and the poet's beliefs by analysing his own discomfort in the presence of the "philosophies" of Wordsworth, Shelley, and Goethe. He might perhaps have taken advantage of the clue he himself supplies in relating in another lecture Johnson's poetic success to Johnson's "moral elevation", and have exploited the implications of his adolescent enthusiasm for Shelley in relation to his present indifference. Moral elevation is what Wordsworth, for all his earnestness—or, perhaps, solemnity—lacks. It is certainly absent from Shelley, as indeed Mr. Eliot says. As for Goethe, he posed; unconsciously, no doubt, but all the more so on that account. One feels, indeed, that Mr. Eliot's verdicts must usually be just, and he should give us more of them; it is when struggling to explain his taste that he fails us. He has always been prone to semi-oracular statements; one suspects him of having the wish to be helpful without the will to be clear. Here, for example, he would distinguish between beliefs as "held" and beliefs as "felt". It is to be guilty of a defect with which he charges Matthew Arnold, the defect of leaving a statement "in suspension". And the reader is left too—wondering how beliefs could be "felt" without in some sense also being "held".

Again Mr. Eliot appears to insist, with the aid of one of his favourite chemical formulas, that poetic appreciation can only be "subjective". Yet, earlier, he says that "the experience of enjoying a bad poem while thinking it is a good one is very different from that of enjoying a good poem"; and if appreciation is never more than "subjective", then the expressions "a bad poem" and "a good poem" in this context have no meaning. Although Mr. Eliot does not say so, he has taken the semi-oracular affirmation bodily from Mr. I. A. Richards. Presumably this is not acknowledged because throughout the lectures

Mr. Richards is already referred to with a frequency which to some readers will seem excessive.

Altogether, one awaits with a mingled curiosity the Virginia lectures, which are also to be published.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

THE ENGLISH WAY. (Sheed and Ward, 6s.)

THE firm of Sheed and Ward never seem to be at a loss for a new and original idea with which to entertain the Catholic reading public. *The English Way*, following its sister *The Irish Way*, strives to illustrate by essays on the lives of holy and distinguished Englishmen the relation between universal Catholicism and particular National Spirit. At the present time both terms of the relation tend to lose something of their own greatness through lack of interplay with one another. Catholicism has, no doubt, been strengthened and unified by all the factors that make for rapid communication, but the centralization that results from this is not without its dangers. The centre and head of the Church is in Rome, but the body is in the whole universe. The richness and true universality of the Church depend on the proper and, in their own degree, independent functioning of the cells organized in every part of the globe as well as upon the direction of the head. As for National Spirit—we have little need, these days, to comment upon the dangers attendant in a narrow, self-centred, unintelligent reliance upon the self-sufficiency of geographical units, whether in politics, economics, or religion.

One might then have hoped that a collection of studies of sixteen exemplars of English Catholicism would have revealed the special human contribution made to the true religion in the course of its history by men who happened to be born and bred in our home. But in this respect we are disappointed. Most of the writers make little or no attempt to keep this point of view in mind, Father D'Arcy's short character-sketch of Newman being a brilliant exception. The true Newman, shy and sensitive product of a refined and narrow English university world, led by study and grace to a Church whose very size and all-inclusiveness seemed to envelop him as though with a

garment too loose and rough but made of strong, reliable, and protective material, stands out in the all too few pages devoted to him.

In such short studies as these it is of prime importance that the reader should be left with a clear idea of what kind of person so-and-so was, with the impression he would perhaps have had had he been privileged to know him as a friend, rather than with a résumé that will soon be forgotten of deeds done. Judged by this test, Father Gervase Mathew's study on St. Bede, Mr. Woodruff's Alcuin, Dom David Knowles' St. Wulstan, Father Bede Jarrett's Aelred of Rievaulx (surely the patron of "special friendships"), Father David Mathew's Fisher, and Father D'Arcy's Newman are outstanding.

Of all the essays, two seem to the present reviewer especially worthy to be remembered and re-read in the days when this book will be gathering dust on the library shelf, Father Mathew's "Fisher" for the beauty of style and the clear-cut precision of its descriptions and character drawing, and Mr. Watkin's "Crashaw" for its insight, penetration, and sympathy. There is no space here for quotations from Father Mathew; the reader must himself pick up the book to enjoy the well-chosen words that will reveal to him as well as a painting the portraits of Henry VIII, Catherine, Erasmus, and Fisher himself. Mr. Watkin sees Crashaw as the poet and Christian who goes straight to that unity of spirit and sense which is the essence of pure Catholic love and devotion. "His prayer is passion and his passion prayer. Prayer, poetry, passion—their unison is the formula of Crashaw's religious art." This is certainly not the way in which the average religious Englishman expresses himself, yet, if we add awe, is not this unity embedded somewhere deep down in him? It is more often *expressed* by people of Southern climate, but its nature is such that its frequent expression is a sign of waste rather than of use. Has not this deep unity done something to keep the Englishman sane and decent and human? "Such a sweet inebriated ecstasy was pre-eminently Crashaw's religion. He does not preach; he does not torment himself over his sins; he does not worry about his prospects of salvation; he simply adores,

contemplates, exults, dances, fiddles, plays. He can carry off the most preposterous conceits, for they are not the frigid exhibitions of ingenuity, but the toys with which he plays before the shrine." Thus does this unity bubble up in the poet's mind. It would be nice to think that it also stands for the hidden spirit of English Catholicism, and the fact that the average Englishman would die rather than admit it is no proof that it does not.

It is odd that in such a collection as this there is no mention of St. Dunstan, nor of one at least of the Cardinals of Westminster.

MICHAEL DE LA BÉDOYÈRE.

A RECALL TO DANTE. (Sheed & Ward, 6s.)

MISS ALICE CURTAYNE has written a series of essays with the aim of recalling to Dante those "English-reading Catholics" for whom, she finds, he is a "neglected inheritance". And, deprecating the idea that erudite scholarship is a necessary preparation for enjoyment of the *Divine Comedy*, she shows how every Catholic has the key to the essential understanding of a poem that is an embodiment of Catholic teaching.

The biographical sketch that occupies about a third of the book should go far to predispose readers to sympathetic understanding of Dante and his work. She has the gift of concrete detail that quickens the dry bones of history, as when she imagines Dante returned from battle, throwing off "his spurred dusty boots and heavy coat of mail", to turn his mind to a poem, "My lady carries love within her eyes"; or shows how the shaft of exile caught him "possessed of the clothing he wore and, it seems, very little else". There are just one or two points on which one may quarrel with her, as when, for instance, she would minimize the real content of Dante's confession to Beatrice in the "Earthly Paradise", as though the "lofty moral standard enforced throughout the *Commedia*" necessarily implied achievement and not an aspiration to which life would conform only at the end of an earthly counterpart of the threefold pilgrimage (a constant effort of adequation, which gives the life of Dante an added dramatic pathos). Again, I would

question whether "Florentine history [of Dante's time] has no practical interest to-day", when that precocious city-state anticipated so much that is modern. There are pages of Dino Compagni, Dante's contemporary, describing the events of 1301 that apply word for word to the Italy of 1922, while Dante's craving for "universal peace, the best of all things ordained for our blessedness", his conception of the Emperor as a necessary tribunal for the peaceable settlement of international disputes, bring him very near to us. His political ideals and activities are too fundamental to him to be lightly dismissed; it is their frustration, in reality by the break-up of the mediaeval unity, but apparently by the policy of the Popes and of his own Florence, that explains his bitterness against both.

A second essay, "Order in the study of Dante", warns readers against the misrepresentations of a certain Protestant tradition among English Dante scholars. "Dante in English" compares famous translations in prose and verse, strongly advocating the former, and adding an awful warning to those who would reproduce the terza rima. (Here I maintain impenitently that the mistake has lain, not in the verse medium, but in failure to recognize that Dante used no poetic diction, but language of stark and even colloquial simplicity.) The final chapters, on the *Divina Commedia* itself, are among the best, and are bound to effect their object, to send readers to the original so lovingly and understandingly presented. All Catholics must be grateful for those on "Dante and the Holy Name", "Dante and Our Lady", and "Prayer in Dante", and indeed for a suggestive and stimulating book.

BARBARA BARCLAY CARTER.

THE LIMITATIONS OF SCIENCE. By J. W. N. Sullivan.  
(London: Chatto and Windus, 303 pp., 7s. 6d. net.)

ONE of the greatest benefits we owe to St. Thomas Aquinas is the clear distinction between the natural and the supernatural orders. The confusion between these two orders of events is perhaps mainly responsible for what is commonly called the warfare between Science

and Theology. We may admit, for the sake of precision, that this warfare exists only between the scientists and the theologians and not between the disciplines themselves. But we need not attempt to deny its existence. It has its origin in the fact that God is at once immanent and transcendent, pervading the universe, and sustaining not only all its being but all its manifestations and activities; and is yet distinct from the universe. The theologian, owing to his sense of the complete and intimate dependence of the world upon God—having, as Maritain puts it, his thought about creation *polarized* by theology—can with difficulty avoid the tendency to seek the explanations of natural events in divine interventions of an exceptional and quasi-miraculous character, to interpret nature in terms of divine purpose, and to regard with distaste the laborious and uninspiring efforts of the men of science, seeking the causes of natural events in antecedents of the natural order and weaving little by little a dense web of natural causation that seems to screen and shut off God from the world.

It is difficult to blame the men of science for their endeavours to eliminate from the natural sciences the innumerable short-cuts to God taken by the unscientific pious. Nevertheless, paths that even the uninstructed may safely follow *do* lead from the created to the Creator.

Even the uninstructed may safely follow these paths. If this is true, it seems obvious that they must lead from the universe as humanity in the mass apprehends it; and from that it follows that the common vision of the universe must have, at least, a certain fundamental truthfulness.

From this common picture of things, the picture presented by modern science is coming to differ more and more. What these differences are, and how great they are, is made amply clear by Mr. Sullivan in his important and lucid book. The most fundamental aspects of reality—Space, Time, Causality itself—have in the hands of the mathematical physicists become mere caricatures of what humanity at large means by these terms.

Certain philosophers and theologians, whose intentions are perhaps more admirable than their judgment, are



attempting to construct Theodicies on various fragments detached from the modern scientific structure. For the proofs of God elaborated by St. Thomas, writers like Dean Inge and Professor Chevalier tend to substitute one drawn from the second law of thermodynamics, which suggests that the universe is running down like a clock and therefore must have had a beginning in which it was wound up. As Mr. Sullivan says, "the accepted laws of nature lead us to a definite beginning of the universe in time". But it must be noted that the theological conclusion to which this seems to lead will not necessarily be the conclusion of Science. "The analysis on which these results have been based", says Mr. Sullivan, "has not, we may suppose, been sufficiently discriminating. It may be, he thinks, that it is owing to the inadequacy of the notion of *time*, as it occurs in science, that the doctrine of the decaying universe leads us to an actual beginning of time. The short-cut to God through the million million years of the degradation of energy is too short for science.

Other thinkers have been seized with enthusiasm for the so-called Principle of Indeterminacy and have attempted to find in it a foundation for the belief in Free Will. But the basis of the principle of indeterminacy, according to Mr. Sullivan, is "the fact that we cannot observe the course of nature"—say, the behaviour of an electron—"without disturbing it". It depends on the fact that "any observations we make in order to get the necessary data disturb our electron in an unpredictable way, and therefore our data become useless in the very act of obtaining them". It seems, however, that this difficulty concerns the possibility of an adequate scientific description of the determinism of events, and in no way affects the belief that events are, in fact, adequately determined. It has, in any event, no particular bearing on the question of the freedom of the will, for which we reject determinism simply because adequate determining conditions are, from the nature of the case, ordinarily unobtainable.

In general, it may be observed that the theologians who attempt to attach themselves and their science to the

modern scientific procession are not seldom received with snubs and found eventually a good deal behind its tail end. Only too often their fate is like that of the celebrated lady of Niger, who went for a ride on the tiger.

W. R. THOMPSON, F.R.S.

THE SPIRIT OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT. By Christopher Dawson. (Sheed and Ward.)

FOR the historian, to enquire into the "spirit" of a movement is, practically, to seek for its cause; and the cause or "spirit" of the Oxford Movement is a subject upon which there is as yet little agreement among historians. Broadly speaking, two theories are in the field: the average Anglo-Catholic view, to which non-Catholic sympathizers of the Movement have given qualified adhesion; and the unsympathetic view, or case for the prosecution, which is commonly, but unfairly, held to be the semi-official Catholic position.

In the former theory the spirit of the Oxford Movement is the Spirit of God, working in a distressed (but authentic) province of the Church of God, for its sanctification and His glory. The apparent and secular alliance of the Church of England with Protestantism was a deplorable effect of historical causes; the Oxford Movement bore witness to the superficial, accidental, and temporary nature of this alliance, and set about to end it. The Movement continues to this day in everything that can possibly be called "Anglo-Catholic". It exists to reassert and defend the dogma of the Catholicity of the Church of England, and secondarily to effect such changes in the government and praxis of that Church as the Protestant alliance has rendered necessary. Its leaders were and are ministers of God, as Athanasius or Hilary were his ministers; the movement as a whole bears the same interpretations as the counter-reformation, more especially inasmuch as the latter was operative in countries which had remained Catholic. Since the Catholicity of the Church of England appears to be an essential postulate of this position, it must remain unacceptable to those who "deny the major".

The opposite theory is based upon fact rather than

theological speculation. Several of the leaders of the Oxford Movement became Catholics, and many of their followers and disciples have since taken the same step. Much of the outward appearance of Anglo-Catholicism bears a marked resemblance to the externals of Catholicism. It is argued that the whole ethos of the movement must be an imitative approximation to modern Catholicism. This conclusion is accepted more or less consciously by many Catholics, but it is also the official doctrine of the Protestant opposition to the Movement within the Church of England. It is open to the following objections: that far more of the sons of the Movement have died in the Church of England than ever became Catholics; that "protest against Rome" was an important essential in Newman's "Via Media", and is still an integral part of representative Anglo-Catholicism; and that the leaders of the Movement have been, almost without exception, men of a character to which mimicry or aping (as a dominant motive) would be profoundly antipathetic.

Christopher Dawson has now provided a third theory, which seems to escape the difficulties of the other two. Of the nineteenth century he writes: "The real religious issue before the age was not whether High Church or Low Church views should prevail in the Church of England, but whether the Christian religion should preserve its spiritual identity, or whether it should be transformed by the spirit of the age and absorbed into the secularized culture of the modern world." And: "The fundamental note of the Oxford Movement was its *anti-modernism*." Those who cannot accept an interpretation of the Movement based upon a belief in the Catholicity of the Church of England may be grateful for an alternative in which no more is assumed about that body than its "Christianity"; and it may be less disturbing to think of pious non-Catholics in the grip of a "*gegenzeitgeist*" than to see them as the instruments of the Holy Spirit.

On the other hand, this new theory is unquestionably nearer most of the facts than the facile "imitation" view. It explains, for instance, why the attraction exerted by Catholicism upon the members of the Oxford Movement

has not been universal or constant, for there is only an indirect connexion between "anti-modernism" and the Catholic Church. And, what is more important, Christopher Dawson's thesis accounts satisfactorily for a phenomenon which must otherwise seem strangely fortuitous, if not contradictory: the fact that the early leaders were drawn from every party in the Church—Newman an Evangelical, Keble a High Church Tory, Hurrell Froude a pure Disestablishmentarian, Pusey a Liberal Moderate, and W. G. Ward a Benthamite. Hurrell Froude's clear-headed intransigence and brilliant personality, the "one good deed" of his life (bringing Keble and Newman together), and his voice from the grave (the publication of his "Remains"), these were the forces, symbolizing the "Spirit of the Oxford Movement", which transformed the curious medley of academic persons into a religious revival.

More interesting still, the Oxford Movement, on this showing, exhibits striking parallels with the contemporary revival of Catholicism in Europe. It is a fascinating speculation in the philosophy of history to reflect upon the possible common origin of the *Essai sur l'Indifférence*, the *Ideal of a Christian Church*, and the "dark Syllabus".

N. J. ABERCROMBIE.

CAVALIER. Letters of William Blundell to his friends, 1620-1698. Edited by Margaret Blundell. (Longmans. 10s. 6d.)

FROM the papers at Crosby Miss Margaret Blundell has built up a description of a seventeenth-century Catholic family. The letters of William Blundell of Crosby form the backbone of the volume, but the author has also had the assistance of his household accounts and other memoranda to help her to complete the portrait. A careful selection and a judicious use of explanatory detail have enabled her to present a delightful picture of a Royalist Catholic family, devoted to their religion, attached with every fibre to the country life, unthinkingly loyal in politics and in religious matters very sensitive. Humour of a playful homely fashion, a calculated and generous self-sacrifice, courage, and a faint and changing

hope of alleviation are evident in this lifetime's correspondence. Hope must always have subsisted as long as there remained the Stuarts. William Blundell's outlook was individual, with that individuality which the English manor life developed, and he possessed, as the author herself remarks, "Man's inexhaustible curiosity". One is reminded that he stood near the beginning of the long road which led to Waterton. A cheerfulness encouraged by his early, prudent, happy marriage to Anne Haggerston pervades his writing. A welcoming courtesy, a readiness to go forth and meet all Catholics of his rank, becomes apparent. The custom of "arranged marriages" led him to Northumberland and Derbyshire; while political unanimity, granted the strong Royalism of all Catholics, gave a solidarity to each meeting. In regard to the Haggerstons, these pages provide an interesting counterpart to the eighteenth-century descriptions in the Everingham Papers, when the frost had settled upon English Catholicism.

The way in which the ties of social obligation remained unimpaired by conflicting religious loyalties is seen in the relations between the Blundells and the Earls of Derby. This serves to emphasize the fact, so clear from the Rush-ton Correspondence, that the Catholics bore no animus against those who acted against them carrying out the law. The Justices of the Peace, the local Members, the Government, even the King himself were not regarded by the Catholics as responsible for the Penal Laws. These were seen rather as some devastating force like the Plagues of Egypt. Intimate friends, Catholic and Protestant, would unite to stave off their worst effects. The assistance which Blundell received from his Protestant cousin Roger Bradshaigh makes pleasant reading. Appreciation of these facts is made easier by the author's perfectly balanced and unprejudiced comment.

Another factor of considerable bearing on social life is emphasized by a study of this volume. While the Recusants of a certain standing maintained friendly contact through the various counties they had little association with the converts who had reached the Church as a result of the Catholic influences at the Stuart Court.

This is easily understandable of the Restoration circle, but it applies equally to the Queen's friends at the Court of Charles I. A student of the rise, influence and dissolution of the "old Catholics" as a close corporation would find material here for a study of the origins. In this connexion the correspondence relating to the marriage of Emilia Blundell with the fifth Lord Mountgarrett is interesting. The parents of both parties were Catholic; but they moved along different orbits. There was a great contrast between the steady country round at Crosby and the structure of life of those Anglo-Irish Butler peerages which depended upon Ormonde, a great family grouping, wholly Catholic in sympathy, but only partially Catholic in practice, expensive in manner of living, often insolvent. Here the Kilkenny Papers form an excellent counterpart to the Blundell account. In the disagreements between the families both before and after the marriage, it is clear that the criticism that the Mountgarret Butlers lacked staying power was well founded. As the life of William Blundell progresses it is not difficult to see how Lancashire is the core of Catholic England.

Among the household detail which the author has collected the Book of Recipes for sickness has special interest. Together with the elaborate preparation for visits to relations, the teaching of the girls within the family circle and the details of the chapel furniture, "for church stuff, six suits and two cups", it contrives to suggest an isolation from the capital and its sudden changes which can well explain the unaltering character of life at Crosby. Slight references, like that to Blundell's obvious attachment to the unfashionable card game of gleeke, increase the impression of remoteness. There were only two alternatives, home and prison. Organized Catholic education had been long settled, and, though the boys might be at St. Omer and two daughters with the Poor Clares at Rouen, there was no need for the rest of the family to stir abroad. One is reminded at times of that other Catholic gentleman, Mr. Fursden, with whom Augustine Baker lived in Devonshire. Yet, all the more because of the remoteness from London and the changing



Stuart fashions, Mr. Blundell's spirituality is in the full tradition of the Catholic seventeenth century. It is curious to compare his thought with that which finds expression in the *Private Devotions* of his commander in the Civil Wars, the seventh Earl of Derby. Lord Derby's prayers and meditations, jotted down like so much of the Crosby memoranda in a commonplace book, have their own attraction; but they suggest in every line the Hampton Court Conference and the Jacobean Episcopate. William Blundell's religious writings, on the other hand, have little to mark their nationality. They come from the mould in which Catholic spirituality has run since Trent. His chief formative influences seem to have been Ignatian; for he had a wholehearted and lifelong attachment to the Society of Jesus, to whom he gave up his eldest son. If any proof were needed of the degree to which the Jesuits became indigenous to England it would surely be found in the spiritual submission, the support, and the recruits which they received from such stocks as the Welds and the Blundells.

In William Blundell's case prayer always found its place within his day, as two delightful passages in *Cavalier* make evident. "I was sitting", wrote Blundell in April 1697, "in my chamber over the hall at Crosby with my face directly to the South-West casement there, and being then at my prayer, I did not make such observation as I might otherwise have done." Nearly forty years earlier in a letter to his child in her noviciate his doctrine is expressed quite clearly. "Herideth easily (saith an excellent author)", wrote William Blundell in 1659, "who is carried by the grace of God. Religious persons have observed that the Divine Goodness is oft-times graciously pleased to bestow that delightful fervour upon weak and young beginners to sweeten their memories and understandings with a taste of spiritual joys." He has echoes at times of de Castaniza, for *The Spiritual Conflict and Conquest* in the seventeenth-century English translation had penetrated into the Catholic houses. He had, too, that understanding of the precise regimen of convents, the rules as to noviciates and professions, which characterized the more devout laity reared in the atmosphere of

Tridentine Catholicism. "I shall be glad", he wrote to his daughter, "if any of these reflections may strengthen your resolutions or procure you a good thought. The smallest of God's creatures, or our ordinary actions, are made a ladder by the greatest masters in spirit to ascend to Heaven. I would not write much unto you of other matters; and when you come to be enclosed it will not become me so well to say so much of this." A portion of William Blundell's life was passed in prison. He was always subject to fines for his religion; he was very seldom secure. One of his phrases sums up his own experience. "Thank God for that . . . he hath given you an occasion to exercise a true Christian Fortitude which is the chief of the Cardinal Virtues."

DAVID MATHEW.

A ZOO HOLIDAY. By Gertrude Gleeson. (2s. 6d.)

JUDY AND THE MAGIC ROCKET. By Dorothy Dudley Short. (2s.)

MUDDY PAWS. By K. D. Nason. (2s.)

THE NIGHT-SCHOOL OF THE LEARNED SWAN. By C. F. Oddie, S.R. (2s. 6d.)

THE CHILDREN'S STORY-BOOK OF BEES. By Gareth G. Browning. (2s. 6d.) (Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd.)

Books for children are generally considered to be literature of second-rate importance. They only receive attention in Christmas supplements, and at a time, as the publishers say, when book-shops sell what they happen to have in stock rather than stock what is worth selling. But the discovery of literature that shall both interest and educate children is as difficult as it is important. Messrs. Burns and Oates have this year produced a "Nature and Science Series for Children" which will go a long way towards the solution of the problem. Children, nowadays, tend to be sophisticated, and they are apt to despise the traditional simple stories that seem to have satisfied their parents. They seem even to prefer "grown up" books. But it is not really the simplicity so much as the unreality and fatuity of the old kind of children's literature which they dislike. The

volumes that make up this series are simple enough and beautifully written, but their real merit lies in their reality. They deal with *what is, what can be made use of*, in the animal world and in the world of Nature. Moreover, they clothe *what is* with a veil of romance and colour at once perfectly suited to the subject and to the child reader. The child does not romance in the air, so to speak, he romances about what is real, in order to make it more real for him. Take Gareth Browning's *Story-book of Bees*. What a world of complex activity, of doing, of romance, the beehive offers! Miss Browning sees it as the child loves to see it, as a "City of Magic" filled with "magical chapels", guarded by "sentry-bees", ruled by "the Court of the Queen"; and into this setting a number of stories are fitted, the whole providing a child with a true and never-to-be-forgotten understanding of what really happens to bees, hives and honey. The child who reads this book will enjoy some hours of "magic" entertainment and will obtain a piece of scientific knowledge that will probably start a lifelong interest and hobby. Lord Baden Powell is surely not exaggerating when he writes of it, as of the others in the series: "Any youngsters who are sensible and not little gumpts will read this book with real enjoyment." These books deserve and will obtain a very wide recognition—we know of none that surpass them in their line.

A. T.

LIFE OF FATHER IGNATIUS SPENCER, O.P. By Father Urban Young, C.P. (Burns Oates and Washbourne.)

THIS is a competent account of a man of heroic sanctity and most exceptional personality. Before I read this book its subject was, I must confess, no more than a name, and I do not suppose he is well known to Catholics of the present day. I hope Fr. Young's biography may restore an unjustly forgotten memory. A scion of the typical Whig nobility who became not only a Catholic at a time when Catholics were regarded with loathing and contempt, but a priest and finally a Passionist who travelled up and down the country in a shabby habit, begging prayers and alms, was no ordinary man. No saint has

ever trampled human respect more completely underfoot. His father, Lord Spencer, sums up the entire spirit of the correct Anglicanism of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century when he writes to his son, still a clergyman. "If religious study be not under the corrective guidance of greater learning and experience than it is possible for you to have as yet, it might lead into the wilderness of enthusiasm, instead of the sensible and sound doctrine which it becomes an orthodox minister of the Established Church to hold for himself and preach to others." That such an environment should produce a spiritual kinsman of St. Benedict Joseph Labre and Bl. Louis Marie Grignon de Montford! Was it heredity or environment? I wonder if the annals of hagiography can display a more striking scene than Fr. Spencer's interviews with Lord Palmerston. The saint urging on the Foreign Secretary his Crusade of prayer for the conversion of England and the sarcastic and sceptical politician with his final remark, "As to what you are doing, as it must tend to conciliate Catholic powers towards England, what have I to say, but that it is excellent?" What a picture it calls up: the supernatural in its purest and most powerful embodiment at grips with the wisdom of this world. Like his friends Kenelm Digby and Ambrose Philipps de Lisle, Fr. Spencer belonged to a small Cambridge movement towards Catholicism which preceded and preluded the greater but double-edged Oxford Movement. Already as the Anglican parson of the family living he lived the life of a saint—stripping himself of every belonging for the poor. His end matched his life—sudden heart failure from overwork as he was walking up the drive to a friend's house. In view of Spencer's undoubted holiness before he thought of becoming a Catholic as it is portrayed by his biographer's description, it seems a pity to call his religion as a Protestant a "pinchbeck piety" as opposed to "spiritual realities". Protestant Christianity of every shade has produced souls of a most solid and genuine piety. The first Trappist monks in England since the Suppression of the order (in this connexion Cistercian would be a better term) did not arrive in 1835. There was a community of Trappists, refugees from the Revo-

lution, in Devonshire at the beginning of the century. Ecclesiastical Tithes Act is a mistake for Ecclesiastical Titles Act. And it sounds a little strange to speak of assisting at Holy Communion.

THE PILGRIM'S GUIDE TO ROME. By Captain Clifford Constable, O.B.E., M.C. With a Preface by Rev. Francis J. Woodlock, S.J., M.C. (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 4s. 6d.)

THIS guide of convenient size with well-arranged itineraries for a ten days' visit to Rome will be very useful to many, and save much unnecessary waste of time and money. When this has been said, I can say little more in its favour. Too often a note of patronizing lecturing is adopted e.g. "Now shut the book temporarily and enjoy this lovely spot." "We will now enter the Basilica. Rest quietly for a few minutes. Walk slowly up the nave . . . stopping to kneel down as you pass the chapel of the Blessed Sacrament." And there are irritatingly banal *obiter dicta* on works of art. "The ceiling" of the Sistine chapel "is considered . . . the most powerful painting in existence." "Raphael's Transfiguration is considered to be . . . the finest picture in the world." How can one place masterpieces in an order of merit like boys in an examination list? But the most serious defect of the book is its complete and flagrant lack of criticism. Wellnigh every relic, however preposterous, is accepted as authentic, legends long since exploded by the consent of scholars are set down as historical. There is St. George's spear and a portion of his banner, the relics of Our Lady's veil and St. Joseph's cloak. We are shown the site of the tree to which St. Sebastian was bound when shot by arrows—in his purely legendary act; where a spring of oil gushed forth miraculously in the reign of Augustus; where St. Peter baptized Sts. Processus and Martinian in a spring which miraculously gushed forth from the prison floor. Surely the known truth has its claims. If only the Bollandist fathers, or Fr. Thurston or Dom Leclercq, could give us a pilgrim's guide to Rome! Unfortunately they are occupied by even more important works. E. I. WATKIN.

